TENURE UNIT STANDARD ROUTING SHEET

In support of the following academic policy statements, tenure unit performance standards will be maintained and made publicly available by the Office of the Provost's Faculty Records Team. Per policy, each of these sets of standards will be reviewed every five (5) years, submitted to the Office of the Provost using this routing form for all signatures.

- APS 900417, Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty
- APS 980204, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)
- APS 820317, The Faculty Evaluation System of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Please note the following:

- Use a separate routing sheet for each set of tenure unit standards.
- Submit files in portable document format (PDF) only.
- Ensure the set of standards being submitted ***have been approved*** by the tenure unit ***and*** college dean.

Tenure Unit: Psychology

College/Unit:

☐ CAM   ☐ COCJ   ☑ CHSS   ☐ COM   ☐ NGL
☐ COBA   ☐ COE   ☐ COHS   ☐ COSET

Standard:

◯ Promotion and Tenure   ⦿ Post-Tenure Review   ◯ Faculty Evaluation System (FES)

Contact:

Name (first & last): Jorge G. Varela, Ph.D.

SHSU Email: jgv002@shsu.edu

Phone: 936-294-3052

Approved By:

(signature)
_____
Department Chair

(signature)
Leif French (Nov 29, 2022 14:29 CST)
_____
College Dean

_____
Provost & Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Evaluations,
Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure review
Psychology Faculty

I. OVERVIEW OF GUIDELINES

A. **Purpose of Guidelines:** This document provides guidelines for the evaluation for all tenured and tenure-track faculty for the following: the annual Faculty Evaluation System (FES), Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review. These guidelines are meant to provide a set of common expectations and enhance transparency in the evaluation of performance at each of these decision points. The annual evaluation process provides a basis for the awarding of merit increase, when available, and creates a record of performance that will be used for decision-making with respect to promotion and tenure as well as post-tenure review.

B. **Basis for Evaluation**

1. **Scholarly and/or creative accomplishment:** Sustained scholarly accomplishment is expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Psychology Program. Scholarly work pertains to original work that is informed by and shows engagement with the larger body of literature on the topic at hand and/or a systematic review of the larger body of literature, with all assertions supported by relevant sources or logical argument and may or may not involve data collection.

2. **Teaching:** The department is committed to maintaining high standards of teaching both inside and outside the classroom. Teaching consists of direct involvement with student learning and includes classroom instruction, individual instruction, supervision of students in research and independent study, and supervision of clinical work or other applied work. Teaching also includes development of new courses, laboratories, and teaching methods as well as publication of and/or development of instructional materials. Faculty members are expected to maintain a high level of knowledge and expertise in their discipline and to incorporate new knowledge into courses on a continuing basis.

3. **Service:** Assistant Professors on the tenure track, Associate Professors progressing toward promotion to Professor, and tenured faculty undergoing post-tenure review, are expected to provide service to the department, college, university, profession, and/or engage in professionally relevant community service. Although service activities of various types are expected of all faculty members, acceptable levels of service will likely vary depending on faculty rank, examples of which are specified below.

C. DEFINITIONS

1. **Scholarship:** Psychologists traditionally disseminate their research through primary scholarship that involves peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and book chapters; serving as an (co-)editor of a scholarly (published) book; and obtaining external grant funding (especially when serving as the Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator) as indicators of research quality.

   Secondary forms of scholarship are also valued, but to a lesser degree than primary forms of scholarship. Examples of secondary scholarship include conference presentations (e.g., posters/exhibits, workshops, symposiums, round tables, paper presentations, panels, debates, etc.), book reviews, brief encyclopedia entries (cf. full-length chapters included in multi-volume book sets titled as encyclopedias of the field), popular media articles (e.g., Psychology Today), and serving in other roles on a grant (e.g., investigator, consultant).

   Both collaborative and multi-disciplinary work are common in psychology, and the department encourages faculty to engage in such work. The candidate's contribution in this work will be evaluated as part of the tenure and promotion process and in the annual FES. Assessment of multi-disciplinary work will especially consider the attention given to the psychological dimensions of the work.

   These lists are not meant to be exhaustive. Candidates may choose to include other forms of *documented* evidence. In assessing scholarship, the DPTAC takes the following into account:

   a. Peer-reviewed/referred journal articles and published books are the "gold standard" of scholarship
   b. Serving as an/the editor of a peer-reviewed book is highly valued
   c. Chapters in edited volumes are considered important forms of primary scholarship
   d. Awarded external research grants count as scholarly activity, as does the preparation and submission of major grant applications (the availability of grants varies greatly in psychology, depending on the candidate's area of study. All faculty are encouraged but not required to apply for external funding)
   e. External grant funding is preferred over internal grant funding, but both contribute to scholarship/creative activities
   f. Pedagogical works (such as textbooks) may count as publications toward tenure, provided they have a demonstrable influence on the discipline
   g. An article, book, or book chapter that is conditionally accepted or "in press" is given as much weight as one that is published. If the work is "under review"

or at the stage of "revise and resubmit," it counts merely as evidence of work in progress

h. Book reviews and conference presentations will be considered as well

In assessing the quality of scholarship, the DPTAC considers:

a. Role in authorship (first author or senior/last author)
b. Publication involving students as co-authors (graduate or undergraduate)
c. Works reporting the results of multiple studies
d. Completion of preregistered studies and publication of registered reports
e. Interdisciplinary or international collaboration
f. Publication requiring primary data collection, with additional value demonstrated by longitudinal, in person, or otherwise effort-intensive methods of data collection (e.g., vulnerable or traditionally understudied populations)
g. Funding in support of scholarly activities, with consideration of duration and monetary size of funded grant
h. Recognition by experts in the faculty member's field (e.g., citations, media coverage, research awards, appointments to scholarly service positions).
i. Quality and selectivity of the research outlet, as indicated by the following:
    i. Impact ratings
    ii. Citation indexes
    iii. Acceptance rates
    iv. Audience base
    v. Reputation of editors/authors
    vi. Indexing
    vii. Use of open science practices (e.g., pre-registration, open data and/or code, and open access through publishing in high-impact open-access journals)

Possible indicators of leadership in scholarly work include:

a. Editor or Associate Editor of a peer-review publication or special issue
b. Editorial board membership for a peer reviewed publication/journal
c. Grant review panel membership
d. Administrative position in research society or organization
e. Keynote speaker invitation
f. Invitations to contribute to workshops, conferences, books, journals, and other outlets of scholarship
g. External grant submission or funding, particularly for project roles considered "Primary Grant-writing"
h. Chairing graduate student (e.g., thesis/dissertation) and undergraduate student (Honor's College, McNair Program) research projects to completion.

i. Role in authorship (i.e., first or senior/last author) Leading non-funded interdisciplinary, international, and other large-scale research projects involving one or more research teams including non-student researchers from outside of the department, college, and/or university

Candidates must demonstrate consistent engagement in scholarly activity throughout the evaluation period. As a general rule, this entails clear evidence of engagement in the research process during each year of evaluation. Factors that indicate sustained research effort can include the following:

a. Proposal development
b. Study preregistration
c. Data collection
d. Data management and analyses
e. Manuscript submission
f. Manuscript publication
g. Grant writing
h. Partnerships with private industry and other similar funding sources
i. Conference presentations
j. Evidence of meeting goals enumerated in Annual Individual Professional Evaluation section of FES

Items related to scholarship that are *complete* are distinguished from those that are *forthcoming*, and both are distinguished from *works in progress*.

a. In the case of written scholarship, *complete* items are written and accepted for publication (either published or in press), while *works in progress* are written but neither complete nor accepted for publication.
b. In the case of presentations, complete items are presentations that have occurred whereas forthcoming items are those that are accepted for presentation but have yet to occur.
c. For annual evaluations (FES), faculty members can count a piece of written scholarship as a publication only once. For example, if a faculty member chooses to count an article as published when it is in press, but not yet in its final printed or electronic form, they cannot count it in a subsequent year or years when it is still in press or published in its final form.

2. **Teaching:** Faculty are encouraged to demonstrate effective teaching using a variety of activities. Various teaching activities and indicators have been included in the Evaluation of Teaching Rubric (see Attachment 3), which is attached. Evidence of teaching activities that can be included in the candidate's dossier includes, but is not limited to, the following:

a. Teaching professionalism (including adhering to course syllabi; providing timely and clear feedback to students on assignments, tests, and academic progress; submitting grades by established deadlines; holding office hours as scheduled; using technology effectively; maintaining high ethical standards of honesty and objectivity);

b. Course syllabi and examples of other teaching materials;

c. Peer observations of teaching (see Attachment 4);

d. Development and teaching of new courses;

e. Significant revisions of an existing course beyond the expected annual updates;

f. Development of new curriculum materials, teaching methods, and teaching formats;

g. Mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in your research laboratory;

h. Serving on students' thesis/dissertation committees;

i. Serving as chair/advisor for students' theses/dissertations and other research projects;

j. Nomination or selection for a university outstanding teacher award;

k. Nomination or selection for a Texas State University System, professional society, or national outstanding teaching Award;

l. Publication of textbooks or other instructional materials with a reputable university press;

m. Student first authorship on manuscripts;

n. Participation in workshops, conferences, or programs designed to improve teaching;

o. Presentations about teaching at professional meetings;

p. Internal teaching grants submitted and/or internal teaching grants funded;

q. External teaching grants submitted and/or external teaching grants funded;

r. Evidence that faculty has facilitated student success (e.g., contributions to students who have won awards, published papers, etc.);

s. Placement of undergraduate students, graduate students, or post-doctoral fellows into significant academic, scholarly, or professional positions;

t. Participation in University Honors and/or other programs (e.g., McNair) for mentoring the professional development of students;

u. Significantly contributing to the professional development of students (e.g., working with the University Honors program; experiential learning opportunities; writing letters of recommendation; leading peer mentoring program; REU program leadership);

v. Integration of service learning into courses; and

w. Development of substantial course related activities that involve community engagement

3. **Service:** While there are multiple pathways towards meeting expectations for service, faculty members are expected to consistently achieve above a minimal standard of acceptable service, which is documented in the Psychology Faculty FES

Service Rubric (Attachment 4). Each tenured and tenure-track faculty member is expected to contribute service to the department, college, university, and profession, comprising a combination of:

a. serving on and/or chairing departmental, college, and university committees;
b. mentoring either faculty or students, the latter beyond the routine responsibilities associated with teaching;
c. departmental recruitment activities;
d. undertaking departmental initiatives;
e. providing clinical supervision above the responsibilities expected as an instructor of a practicum class;
f. professional service, with examples including reviewing articles for journals, reviewing grant proposals, and leadership in regional or national professional associations; and
g. other categories of services reached in agreement with the Department Chair.
h. Please note that granting tenure, receiving promotion, and satisfactory post-tenure review does not require a candidate to provide service in each of the categories of service listed above, but contributions to multiple areas are expected during the review period in question.

II. GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM (FES)

A. **Overview:** These guidelines will serve as departmental-level implementation of SHSU Academic Policy Statement 820317, *The Faculty Evaluation System*. As described below, faculty members will be evaluated with respect to scholarship, teaching, and service for each calendar year. ***Indicators of performance in one area cannot be used for credit in another area***. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to conflict with this policy statement. In the event of a conflict, APS 820317 will supersede these departmental guidelines. During the spring of each year, all tenured and tenure-track faculty will undergo an evaluation of their performance over the previous calendar year. This evaluation will form the basis for the awarding of merit increases when such increases are available.

B. **Standards for the Annual FES Evaluation[1]**

1. **Scholarship:** The FES evaluation will serve as an instrument to measure that the faculty member has met their annual goals (e.g., an average of one publication per year during the probationary period) and will be considered when candidates apply for tenure and promotion (e.g., when attempting to move from assistant to associate and from associate to full professor). Extenuating circumstances, such as illness or global pandemic, should be *documented*. The impact of these

---

[1] Please note an activity used for credit under one category—scholarship, teaching, or service—cannot be used as an indicator of performance in another category.

circumstances should be documented by the faculty member in their annual FES form. For faculty on a 3-3 teaching load, the rubric in Attachment 1 will be used to score annual performance. For faculty responsible for three (or more) doctoral students and on a 2-2 teaching load, the rubric in Attachment 2 will be used.

2. **Evaluation of Teaching for FES:** All faculty are expected to teach their courses to the best of their ability. This includes teaching courses in their area of specialty as well as core courses based on departmental needs. In order to meet the basic expectations of teaching, faculty are expected to arrive on time and meet with classes as scheduled, schedule and attend regular office hours, provide a syllabus to students that meets all requirements of the university, respond to student emails and phone calls in a timely manner within the regular SHSU working hours, submit grades on time and meet attendance initiative deadlines, and give final exams in accordance with the university calendar. Faculty members who meet these basic requirements will be seen as meeting the basic teaching expectations. The scores on the annual FES for faculty will account for this basic expectation of teaching as well as the indicators of positive performance presented in the teaching rubric (see Attachment 3).

3. **Evaluation of Service for FES:** While there are multiple pathways towards meeting expectations for service, faculty members are expected to consistently achieve above a minimal standard of acceptable service, as demonstrated by rankings on the Department of Psychology FES Service Rubric (see Attachment 4).

C. **Annual FES Evaluation Process:** During the spring of each year and in accordance with university and college deadlines, faculty members will submit a completed electronic CHSS annual FES form and completed scholarship, teaching, and service rubrics to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will meet individually with each faculty member to review these documents and score the annual performance and achievements in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The faculty member's scores will be forwarded to the Dean of CHSS in accordance with deadlines set by the university and college.

III. GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. **Overview:** These guidelines will serve as departmental-level implementation of SHSU Academic Policy Statement 900417, *Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and the Promotion of tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty*. The Department will consider a candidate's performance with respect to scholarship, teaching, and service, as described below. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to conflict with this policy statement. In the event of a conflict, APS 900417 will supersede these departmental guidelines.

B. **Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Granting of Tenure**

1. **Scholarship:** A candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate sufficient quantity and growth in the quality of original, peer-reviewed, publicly disseminated, recognized, and sustained scholarship. Growth in the quality of scholarship can be demonstrated through increasing quality in any of these components (e.g., journal impact factor, authorship, grant writing, publication with students, scholarly reputation, awards, increased complexity of research designs or methodology, number of citations, author-level metrics [e.g., h-index], invited professional presentation of scholarship, etc.).

   The typical department expectation is that an assistant professor will have published the equivalent of approximately one refereed article per year, which should translate to approximately five article-length, peer-reviewed publications for a candidate coming up for consideration in the sixth year. However, candidates must be aware that there is no one quantitative measure that determines a decision on tenure and promotion. In evaluating scholarship, quality, originality, and significance are all factored into the decision.

   We recognize that there are many ways to demonstrate scholarly contributions, and therefore candidates are expected to develop a narrative to address the quality and impacts of their research (see below the section "Quality of Scholarship" for reference). Candidates must also demonstrate consistent and sustained engagement in scholarly activity throughout the probationary period.

2. **Teaching:** A candidate for tenure and/or promotion must present a record that demonstrates successful teaching. A faculty member will normally not be granted tenure or promotion without demonstrating competence and willingness to teach at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of instruction. While some candidates may teach at only one level, evaluators must provide justification for recommending tenure and/or promotion to candidates who have not taught at both levels. All tenure-track faculty shall undergo a peer observation of teaching at least once per academic year (see Attachment 4), and all tenured faculty must undergo a peer observation of teaching at least once every three years.

   While there are multiple pathways towards teaching success, faculty will be evaluated using the departmental rubric to help evaluators quantify the determination of whether a faculty member has met or exceeded teaching expectations. The teaching load for faculty on the tenure track is three courses per academic semester. This load may be reduced for faculty who have additional administrative duties, grant-funded course release, serving as instructor for courses designated as having higher FTE value (e.g., large enrollment, a priori designated graduate courses). These exceptions should be explained by both the candidate in their dossier materials and in the Department Chair's evaluation letter.

3. **Service:** Because the department encourages assistant professors to devote much of their time to research and teaching, service expectations for assistant professors are relatively lower than expectations for tenured faculty. While there are multiple pathways towards meeting expectations for service, faculty members are expected to consistently achieve above a minimal standard of acceptable service, as demonstrated by rankings on the Department of Psychology FES Service Rubric. Along with consistently achieving above a minimal standard of acceptable service, a successful candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, is expected to contribute service to the department, college, university, and profession through a combination of activities presented in section I.C.3.

4. **Prior Service Credit:** Newly hired tenure-track faculty with prior full-time experience as a university faculty member or equivalent role may be eligible for time credit toward tenure, with a maximum of three years of credit. The credit a new faculty member receives will be determined at the point the hiring offer is made by the Dean of CHSS and Provost. The department will make recommendations by assessing past performance using the departmental standards and using the following guidelines as benchmarks:

   a. New faculty members with prior experience as full-time tenure-track faculty experience at another university that included teaching and scholarship requirements, credit will be offered on a year-to-year basis (e.g., a new faculty member with two years of experience will receive two years of credit) when past performance meets the departmental standards outlined in this document.
   b. New faculty members with prior experience as full-time instructors or full-time researchers, but not both, will receive credit on the basis of six months for every year of prior service up to two years when past performance meets the departmental standards outlined in this document.

C. **Standards for Promotion to Professor**

1. **Scholarship:** A candidate for promotion to full professor with tenure must demonstrate continued sustained scholarship and growth in the quality of original, significant, peer-reviewed, publicly disseminated, recognized. A successful candidate for full professor will, at a minimum, have produced five peer-reviewed scholarly artifacts. Growth in the quality of scholarship can be demonstrated through increasing quality in any of these components (e.g., journal impact factor, authorship, grantsmanship, publication with students, scholarly reputation, etc.).

   The usual expectations for promotion to professor include a record of sustained research. A candidate needs to have a robust publication record since having been promoted to associate professor. Publications should be recognized as making

contributions to the subfields of psychology that the faculty members are engaged in.

The candidate's research record should indicate the likelihood of continued leadership in scholarly activities after promotion. This can be reflected in peer-reviewed research/publications, grantsmanship, or other scholarly work. Leadership in scholarship may be demonstrated by recognition of contributions to the field, which may take a variety of forms, including: invited speaker/keynote at conferences/meetings; editing volumes/books/chapters; being nominated for or receiving awards related to scholarship; serving in lead roles in research groups; acting as an editor for academic journals; organizing panels, consortiums, scholarly meetings, or conferences; serving as PI on grants funding multiple researchers; publishing as lead or senior author; and publishing in higher-ranking venues/outlets.

Furthermore, the candidate should make a sustained contribution to the intellectual culture of the University. Evidence of this would be contributions to departmental/college/university events, talks, workshops, seminars, speaker series, or conferences. To document this activity, the candidate must present a brief description of the aim of this activity, how it contributed to the intellectual growth of a particular group, and the length of the activity.

2. **Teaching:** The department and college require faculty seeking promotion to full professor to make significant contributions in the area of instruction with the expectations that this level of instruction will continue in the future. These contributions consist of activities in regularly scheduled classes; work with individual students on research projects, honors projects, theses, and dissertations; and the development of new or revised courses, programs, and/or concepts of instruction. Faculty are expected to provide documentation of their contributions in these areas of instruction in their tenure dossier.

3. **Service:** In addition to the above expectations, promotion to Professor requires evidence of leadership in service. Leadership may be demonstrated by activities such as chairing departmental, college, or university committees; consistent patterns of mentoring and recruitment; and professional service activities such as holding leadership positions in professional organizations and serving on journal editorial boards.

D. **Process for Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion:** During the Spring semester when a faculty member is required to undergo review for promotion and tenure, the Department Chair will convene the DPTAC in accordance with deadlines set by the university and college. The DPTAC Chair (or Co-Chairs) will schedule a meeting with the DPTAC members to review the promotion and tenure materials submitted by the faculty candidates. The DPTAC Chair (or Co-Chairs) will submit a letter to the

Department Chair documenting the DPTAC evaluation of a candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service. This letter will include a summary of all votes and a final recommendation regarding the candidate's suitability for promotion and tenure. The candidate will receive a copy of this letter at the same time as it is officially submitted to the Department Chair.

In addition to the DPTAC letter, the Department Chair will evaluate the candidate's promotion and tenure package and provide a recommendation regarding their suitability for promotion and tenure. This review and recommendation will be documented in a formal letter. The candidate will receive a copy of this letter as soon as it is officially submitted to the Dean of CHSS for review. The Department Chair and DPTAC letters will forwarded to the Dean of CHSS for continued review.

IV. GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

A. **Overview:** These guidelines will serve as departmental-level implementation of SHSU Academic Policy Statement 980204, *Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty*. **The post-tenure review process is not a re-tenuring process but rather a performance evaluation of tenured faculty**. Nothing in these guidelines is intended to conflict with this policy statement. In the event of a conflict, APS 980204 will supersede these departmental guidelines.

B. **Standards for Continued Tenure**

1. **Scholarship:** All tenured faculty are expected to remain active in their scholarly pursuits. In the case of post-tenure review, fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship, and service across the career of the candidate must be considered. Tenured faculty members often play more active roles in department administration/leadership and serve in administrative capacities throughout the university. Consequently, expectations for the volume of scholarly output varies with the specific role each tenured faculty member plays in the university. Considering these circumstances, the department considers publication of two peer reviewed articles (or equivalent forms of scholarship) during the post-tenure period to meet expectations. This is meant as a general guideline rather than an inflexible requirement and additional relevant factors must be included in the qualitative section of the evaluation.

2. **Teaching:** The department and college require post-tenure faculty to demonstrate continued contributions in the area of instruction with the expectations that this level of instruction will continue in the future. These contributions consist of activities in regularly scheduled classes; work with individual students on research projects, honors projects, theses, and dissertations; and the development of new or revised courses, programs, and/or concepts of instruction. Faculty are expected to provide documentation of their contributions in these areas of instruction in

their post-tenure dossier. The DPTAC may make a case for substantive qualitative contributions that may not be reflected in the quantitative teaching scores.

3. **Service:** While there are multiple pathways towards meeting expectations for service, faculty members are expected to consistently achieve above a minimal standard of acceptable service, as demonstrated by rankings on the Department of Psychology FES Service Rubric. Along with consistently achieving above a minimal standard of acceptable service, a successful candidate for post-tenure review is expected to contribute service to the department, college, university, and profession, comprising a combination of activities presented in section I.C.3. Because, in general, faculty pursuing tenure lack opportunities to demonstrate leadership in service, it is expected that the majority of departmental, college, and/or university leadership in service will be conducted by tenured faculty. Leadership in service—demonstrated by activities such as chairing departmental, college, or university committees; consistent patterns of mentoring and recruitment; and professional service activities such as holding leadership positions in professional organizations and serving on journal editorial boards— will be considered in post-tenure review.

Attachment 1

Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Department Chair Evaluation of Scholarship Rubric
Psychology Faculty (3-3 load)

Score	Criteria	Check all that apply
5.0	University, state, regional, national, *or* international award	
	3+ scholarly publications	
	2 scholarly publications and an external grant(s) of over 100k/year	
	Author or editor of 2 or more books	
4.5	2 scholarly publications and 1 or more under review	
	2 scholarly publications, and an external grant(s) of over 50k/ year	
	1-2 scholarly publications and author or editor of 1 book	
4.0	2 scholarly publications	
	1 authored or edited books (no scholarly publication required)	
	External grant of less than 50k/year, but more than 15k/year	
3.5	1 scholarly publication and 1 or more under review	
	1 scholarly publication and 2 or more conference presentations (with at least one at the national level)	
	1 scholarly publication and internal/external grant(s) of 15k/year	
3.0*	1 scholarly publication	
	2 publications under review**	
2.5	1 scholarly publication in preparation and 1 conference presentation	
	1 scholarly publication in preparation and 1 or more under review	
	1 scholarly publication under review and 1 conference presentation	
2.0	1 scholarly publication under review	
	2 or more scholarly publications in preparation	

	1 conference presentation	
1.5	1 scholarly publication in preparation	
1.0	Collecting/working with data but no presentations or scholarly publications in preparation	
0.5	Not collecting data, no conference presentations, no grants, and no scholarly publications in preparation, under review or published	
* While 3 is the "meets expectation" standard, it is not required for tenure that faculty receive at least this score every year. Instead, faculty are expected to, on average across multiple years, receive approximately a 3 ** This can only be used once in the tenure/promotion period to justify a score of "3"		

Additional Stipulations

- Only peer reviewed publications and book chapters fall under scholarly publications
- You cannot count the same article as under review more than once
- Journal articles and other equivalent forms of scholarship can only be counted as published once—either in press or in print—but not both times.
- Publications in non-peer reviewed journals, student-focused research journals, or other similar venues may be considered as 'additional factors' toward the Research Rubric score. Individual faculty members should make an effort to adequately describe the work in question and how it reflects their scholarly efforts for that year.
- Conference presentations include posters/exhibits, workshops, symposiums, round tables, paper presentations, panels, debates, etc.
- With respect to grant awards, serving in a PI or Co-PI role will be assigned greater weight than serving in other roles (e.g., consultants or research evaluators)
- Grants are cumulative totals for the year and can be counted for the total duration of the grant. However, the amount allocated for each year must meet the rubric requirement.
- Grants include those for mentored undergraduate and graduate students
- Grant application submissions can only be counted once as being under review

Score	Additional Factors (only 2 can be received per year)
+ 0.5	major national/ international media coverage of study or research program
+ 0.5	Journal Editor or Associate Editor
+ 0.5	Funding over 300k/year (must be PI, Co-PI, or equivalent role)
+ 0.5	Publishing in high-quality and/or high-impact journals within specific fields (
+ 0.5	Leadership in published, collaborative efforts with other faculty
+ 0.25	Engaged in published, collaborative efforts with other faculty
+ 0.5	Publications on DEI topics (e.g., on race, ethnicity, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, veteran status, physical appearance, etc.)
+ 0.5	Submitting grant application
+ 0.25	Submission of publications, but those publications must be accepted the following year to be used again
+ 0.25	Attending a grant-related event (e.g., grant writing seminar)
+ 0.25	Submitted grant was not funded but received score
+ 0.25	Publication of a preregistered study
+ 0.5	Acceptance of a registered report
+ 0.75	Publication with multiple studies and/or intensive data collection efforts, such as in-person data collection and/or complex procedures
+ 0.25	Publishing a paper with a student
+ 0.5	Additional consideration with justification and approval by the Department Chair

Attachment 2

Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Department Chair Evaluation of Scholarship Rubric
Psychology Faculty (2-2 load)

Score	Criteria	Check all that apply
5.0	University, state, regional, national, *or* international award	
	7+ scholarly publications	
	3+ scholarly publications, and PI or Co-PI on external grant(s) of over 100k/year	
	Author or Editor of 2+ books (no other scholarly publications required)	
4.5	5-6 scholarly publications	
	1-2 scholarly publications, and PI or Co-PI on external grant(s) of over 100k/ year	
	1-2 scholarly publications, and author or editor of 1+ books	
4.0	3-4 scholarly publications	
	1-2 scholarly publications, and PI or Co-PI on external grant(s) of over 50k/ year	
	1-2 scholarly publications, and Co-I or research evaluator on external grant(s) of over 100k/ year	
	1 scholarly publication, and author or editor of 1+ books	
3.5	2 scholarly publications	
	1 scholarly publication, and PI or Co-PI on internal/external grant(s) of over 15k/year	
	1 scholarly publication, and External grant of less than 100k/year, but more than 15k/year	
	1 authored or editor book (no other scholarly publications required)	

3.0*	1 scholarly publication	
	**2 publications under review	
2.5	3+ conference presentations	
	1 scholarly publication under review and 1 conference presentation	
	PI or Co-PI on internal/external grant(s) of between 5k to 15k/year	
2.0	2 conference presentations	
	1 scholarly publication under review	
1.5	1 conference presentation	
1.0	Collecting/working with data, no scholarly publications	
0.5	Not collecting data, no conference presentations, no grants, and no scholarly publications in preparation, submitted or published	
* While 3 is the "meets expectation" standard, it is not required for tenure that faculty receive at least this score every year. Instead, faculty are expected to, on average across multiple years, receive approximately a 3 ** This can only be used once in the tenure/promotion period to justify a score of "3"		

Additional Stipulations

- Only peer review publications and book chapters fall under scholarly publications
- You cannot count the same article as under review more than once
- Peer review journal articles can only be counted towards publication once they are in print (including online) and cannot be counted twice (in print online and paper print)
- Conference presentations include posters/exhibits, workshops, symposiums, round tables, paper presentations, panels, debates, etc.
- PI or Co-PI include subcontracted/site PI or Co-PI
- Grants are cumulative totals for the year and can be counted for the total duration of the grant. However, the amount allocated for each year must meet the rubric requirement
- Grants include those for mentored undergraduate and graduate students
- Publications in non-peer reviewed journals, student-focused research journals, or other similar venues may be considered as 'additional factors' toward the Research Rubric score.

Individual faculty members should make an effort to adequately describe the work in question and how it reflects their scholarly efforts for that year
- With respect to grant awards, serving in a PI or Co-PI role will be assigned greater value than serving in other roles (e.g., consultants or research evaluators)

Score	Additional Factors (only 2 can be received per year)
+ 0.5	Major national/international media coverage of study or research program
+ 0.5	Funding over 300k/year (must PI, Co-PI, or equivalent role)
+ 0.5	Journal Editor or Associate Editor
+ 0.5	Additional consideration with justification and approval by the Department Chair
+ 0.5	Publishing in high-quality and/or high-impact journals within specific fields
+ 0.5	Leadership in published, collaborative efforts with other faculty
+ 0.25	Engaged in published, collaborative efforts with other faculty
+ 0.5	Publications on DEI topics (e.g., on race, ethnicity, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, veteran status, physical appearance, etc.)
+ 0.5	Submitting grant application
+ 0.25	Submission of publications, but those publications must be accepted the following year to be used again
+ 0.25	Attending a grant-related event (e.g., grant writing seminar)
+ 0.25	Submitted grant was not funded but received score
+ 0.25	Publication of a preregistered study
+ 0.5	Acceptance of a registered report
+ 0.75	Publication with multiple studies and/or intensive data collection efforts, such as in-person data collection and/or complex procedures
+ 0.25	Publishing a paper with a student

Attachment 3

Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Department Chair Evaluation of Teaching Rubric
Psychology Faculty

Score	Point Range
5.0	Extraordinary Performance
4.0	Exceeds Expectations
3.0	Meets Expectations
2.0	Below Expectation
1.0	Far Below Expectation

All faculty are expected to teach their courses to the best of their ability. They are also expected to behave in a professional and ethical manner. In order to meet the basic expectations of teaching, faculty are expected to arrive on time and meet with classes as scheduled, schedule and attend regular office hours, provide a syllabus to students that meets all requirements of the university, respond to student emails and phone calls in a timely manner within the regular SHSU working hours, submit grades on time and meet attendance initiative deadlines, give final exams in accordance with the university calendar, and to generally treat students with respect. Faculty who meet all of these basic requirements will be seen as meeting the basic teaching expectations and will receive an initial teaching score of 3.0. Faculty can receive an initial teaching score of less than 3.0 if they do not meet these standards (see starting score criteria below). Faculty may increase their teaching score with evidence of the positive teaching indicators listed below according to the point value in the description.

Teaching Performance Minimum Standards	Completion
Meet with classes as scheduled	
Arrive to classes on time	
Follow the syllabus as given to students	
Provide a syllabus that meets all university requirements	
Respond to student emails and phone calls	
Submit final grades in accordance with university deadlines	
Meet the attendance initiative deadlines	
Give final exams in accordance with the university calendar	

Behave professionally and ethically with students	
Provide informative feedback and grades in a timely manner	

- Faculty are expected to meet all of the minimum standards in order to receive a rating of *Meets Expectations* (3.0).
- Faculty meeting 7-9 of these minimum standards will receive an initial teaching score of 2.5.
- Faculty meeting 5-6 of these minimum standards will receive an initial teaching score of 2.0.
- Faculty meeting 2-4 of these minimum standards will receive an initial teaching score of 1.5.
- Faculty who meet less than 3 of these minimum standards will receive an initial teaching score of 1.0.
- All of these initial teaching scores can be supplemented with participation in additional positive teaching indicators.

Positive Teaching Indicators

Activity	Points
New Courses (List new courses by number and title. Each new course counts as 0.5 points)	
Revised Courses (List courses which you *significantly* revised by number and title. Each significantly revised course counts as 0.25 points)	
Academic Community Engagement (ACE) Courses (List ACE courses which you offered. Each ACE course counts as 0.5 points)	
Uncompensated Overloads (Include uncompensated courses, labs, and independent study courses. List by course number, title, and enrollment for each course that you taught as an uncompensated overload. Each uncompensated overload course counts as 0.25 points)	
Teaching High-Workload Courses List courses that are designated as writing intensive by the university (e.g., research methods) or courses that require extensive preparation, grading, or supervision outside of normal class meetings (e.g., assessment and practicum courses). Each High-Workload course counts as 0.25 points)	
Mentoring Undergraduate/Graduate Student Research (Include undergraduate and graduate student research assistants in your lab, McNair projects, honor's theses, etc. List the student name and title of each research project. *Do not include completed thesis/dissertation projects* (see	

next item for completed projects). 3 or fewer, count as 0.25 points; more than 3, count as 0.5 points)	
Thesis/Dissertation Completion (List the student name and thesis/dissertation title for each thesis that was completed. You may include both undergraduate projects (e.g., honor's theses, McNair projects, etc.) as well a graduate student projects (e.g., theses and dissertations). Member of each committee, count as 0.25 point; chair of each committee, count as 0.5 points)	
***Undergraduate/Graduate Student Conference Presentations** (List the student name(s) and the complete citation for each conference presentation on which a student(s) whom you supervised was an author. Each conference presentation counts as 0.25 points, regardless of how many students are co-authors, with a maximum of 1.0 point for this item.)	
***Publication of Teaching Related Article** (Provide the complete citation for each publication. Each published manuscript counts as 0.5 points)	
***Publication of Teaching Related Textbook** (Provide the complete citation for each publication. Each published textbook counts as 1.0 point)	
Teaching Awards (List awards or honors received for teaching. 0.1 points for nomination for an award, 0.5 points for a university teaching award, 1.0 points for state or national teaching award)	
Peer Evaluation of Teaching (see Attachment 4) (Provide the rating sheet for any peer evaluations that were completed to evaluate your classroom teaching. Receive 0.25 points for each peer evaluation of teaching, receive 0.25 points for each peer-evaluation rating of 3, 4 or 5. You may provide a maximum of two peer evaluations of teaching per year.)	
Professional Teaching Development (List any workshop or teaching conferences attended by activity, title, inclusive dates, and purpose. 2 or fewer, count as 0.1 point; more than 3, count as 0.25 points. These points may be adjusted for longer or multi-day workshops or conferences with Department Chair approval.)	
Other Teaching Activity (List any other relevant teaching activity that is not included in the above items. NOTE: Please provide any documentation for any items listed here as each item must be approved by the Department Chair.)	

Attachment 4

**Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Peer Evaluation of Teaching
Psychology Faculty**

Elements	Evidence/Comments	Ratings					
		1	2	3	4	5	NA
Course Materials							
Syllabus contains all necessary information and follows the CHSS syllabus guidelines.							
Syllabus is clear and easy to follow							
The course calendar is appropriately paced in regard to assignments, exams, and readings							
The texts, materials, and readings are relevant and current							
The content of the class is relevant and appropriate							
Presentation							
Speaks audibly and clearly							
Demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject matter							
Communicates clearly and effectively to the level of the students							
Selects examples relevant to student experiences/course content							
Appropriate eye contact with students							

Speech fillers (such as "umm" and "okay") and pauses were not distracting							
Starts and ends class on time							
Appears well-prepared for class							
Uses class time effectively							
Rapport/Interaction							
Responds appropriately to student questions and comments							
Encourages students to ask questions and participate in class							
Establishes a positive classroom climate							
Respects diverse points of view							
Encourages critical thinking and analysis							
Carefully explains assignments							
OVERALL RATING							

1. What specific activities or techniques stand out as particularly effective that the instructor should keep and develop further?

2. What specific suggestions would you make concerning how this particular class could have been improved?

_____   _____

Evaluator Signature   Date

_____   _____

Faculty Signature   Date

Attachment 4

Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Department Chair Evaluation of Service Rubric
Psychology Faculty

5	Meets 1 standard from Category 5
4.5	Meets 5 of 9 standards from Category 3.5 and 2 standards from Category 4 or above OR Meets 5 of 9 standards from Category 3.5 and 1 standard from Category 4.5
4	Meets 5 of 9 standards from Category 3.5 and 1 standard from Category 4 or above
3.5	Meets all Category 3 standards and 1 standard from Category 3.5 or above
3	Meets all Category 3 standards
2	Meets 3 of 7 standards from Category 3
1	Meets 2 or fewer standards from Category 3

Assign a 0.5-point increase to any category 3.5 or above if you are an Assistant Professor on the tenure track

Category and Activities	Check all that Apply
CATEGORY 3	
Attend all department meetings (as possible, based on teaching schedule and other university requirements)	
Attend 1 CHSS kick-off meeting or similar campus activities (e.g., campus town hall, Office of Diversity training)	
Attend at least 1 student-centered event (e.g., graduation reception, freshman convocation, Master's hooding ceremony)	
Attend job talks of visiting candidates (as possible, based on teaching schedule and other university requirements)	
Complete required trainings (not related to teaching) by deadlines	
Serve on a department committee (as assigned)	
Serve on DPTAC (if eligible)	

Category 3 Comments	
Category 3 Total	

CATEGORY 3.5	
Participate in departmental recruitment activities (in coordination with Department Chair)	
Develop SHSU/community ties (in coordination with Department Chair)	
Complete training programs to help meet student needs (ex: Haven training, IDEA certification)	
Review manuscripts for academic journal(s)	
Mentor junior faculty	
Serve as a board member of a subsection of a regional or national professional association	
Organize a lecture at SHSU, CHSS, or department level	
Serve on a college, or university committee, other than search committee, with demonstrated outcomes	
Provide clinical supervision beyond expected duties with respect to a specific class	
Category 3.5 Comments	
Category 3.5 Total	

CATEGORY 4	
Review external grants (including but not limited to NSF, NEH, NIH, and USDA)	
Mentor student in a meaningful capacity (e.g., McNair, ASPIRE, Road 2 PhD)	
Serve as an editor of a special issue of a journal	
Organize a series of talks at the SHSU, CHSS, or department level	

Undertake significant departmental initiative (e.g., study abroad program) with approval from Department Chair	
Serve on a departmental or college search committee	
Serve as chair of a departmental committee that meets regularly and has demonstrated outcomes	
Serve as faculty sponsor for PSI CHI or other student organization. The latter requires approval from Department Chair	
Uncompensated additional clinical supervision	
Category 4.0 Comments	
Category 4.0 Total	

CATEGORY 4.5	
Chair departmental search committee	
Serve as an executive committee member of a regional or national professional association	
Serve as associate editor of a journal that publishes multiple issues per year (name published in journal with other associate editors)*	
Category 4.5 Comments	
Category 4.5 Total	
CATEGORY 5	
Serve as editor or co-editor of a journal that publishes multiple issues per year*	
Serve as organizer (i.e., program chair) of a significant conference on campus or for a regional or national association (with no compensation) with approval from Department Chair	
Serve as president of a professional organization without compensation	

Serve as program coordinator (graduate or undergraduate) at the department level with no release time and demonstrated outcomes	
Serve (without release time) as chair of a significant committee (e.g., CHSS Diversity and Inclusion) at the college or university level. To qualify for a "5" this service must be pre-approved by the Department Chair and dean.	
Category 5 Comments	
Category 5 Total	
CATEGORY 3.5-5	
The level of service in this category will be determined by the Department Chair in conversation with the faculty prior to the service. Each item on this list can only count once.	
Serve as committee member organizing a significant conference on campus or for a regional or national association (with no compensation).	
Professionally relevant community service (e.g., giving presentations to the community) with approval from Department Chair	
Category 3.5-5 Comments	
Category 3.5-5 Total	
*** Can be used for Service OR Research/Scholarship, but not both**	