

# **Department of Psychology**

## **Faculty Personnel Policy**

**(Original 1976; Revised 1987; Current Version Drafted, 1994)**

**Departmental Approval, December 1994;  
(Revised in Response to A&S Recommendations, July, 1996, and November, 1997)**

**Approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost  
January 15, 1998**

**Revised to include Research Professor Policy  
Approved by Department on November 9, 1999  
Approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost on December 17, 1999**

## Table of Contents

I.	Mission . . . . .	3
II.	Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service . . . . .	3
A.	Definitions. . . . .	3
B.	Assignment of Weights . . . . .	3
C.	Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching . . . . .	5
D.	Criteria for Evaluation of Research . . . . .	7
E.	Criteria for Evaluation of Service . . . . .	8
F.	Peer Review of Teaching . . . . .	9
G.	Departmental and Professional Citizenship . . . . .	11
H.	Breadth of Coverage of Criteria . . . . .	11
III.	Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Salary Increments . . . . .	11
A.	General Philosophy . . . . .	12
B.	Criteria for Annual Salary Increments . . . . .	12
C.	Annual and Cumulative Review of Progress toward Tenure; Reappointment of Probationary Faculty . . . . .	12
D.	Criteria for Promotions . . . . .	12
E.	Criteria for Tenure . . . . .	13
IV.	Departmental Voting Procedures . . . . .	13
V.	Research Professor Personnel Policy . . . . .	16
VI.	Requirements for Adjunct Appointments . . . . .	17
VII.	Release-time Policy . . . . .	17
VIII.	Canceling Courses Due to Low Student Demand . . . . .	18
IX.	Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership . . . . .	18
X.	Evaluation of the Chair . . . . .	20
XI.	Mentoring Policy. . . . .	20
XII.	Re-appointment of Untenured Faculty. . . . .	21
XIII.	Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, and Affirmative Action Policy . . . . .	21
XIV.	Family Leave Policy . . . . .	21
XV.	Status of this Document . . . . .	22

## DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY PERSONNEL POLICY

### I. Mission

The Department of Psychology has four primary missions: (1) To teach undergraduates from many disciplines the basic principles and body of knowledge that broadly define the field and practice of Psychology; (2) To train graduate students in the methods and content of Psychology as a behavioral science; (3) To contribute to the knowledge base and methodological practices of the field through research within Psychology and related fields; (4) To provide professional service to the field and to the university.

### II. Evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Service

#### A. Definitions

1. Research is the development and validation of new knowledge, and normally leads to publication. The term "development" implies basic research and "validation" implies the testing and/or application of basic research. Research development may be demonstrated by published articles in professional journals; research papers presented at professional meetings and participation in symposia; scholarly chapters or books written; grant proposal preparation, submission and funding; and similar efforts at developing and communicating new knowledge. Efforts to validate the implications of basic research in practical settings may involve research outside the basic research laboratory and should be demonstrated in the same ways as basic research efforts.

2. Teaching involves the transmission of knowledge and cultural values and focuses upon helping students to learn, whether in formal courses, in directing individual graduate and undergraduate students projects, the writing of textbooks or in counseling and advising students at any level. Teaching involves both quantitative and qualitative dimensions in its evaluation whether at the level of formal classes, directing individual student projects, or counseling and advising students.

3. Service involves the application of knowledge gained through research and creative achievement, professional service, participation in University Governance, and official administrative duties (such as chair, vice chair, or chair of a major committee). Service at the level of professional service involves the application of a faculty member's professional expertise to the needs of other individuals, groups, or organizations. Service at the level of University governance involves contributions to the effectiveness of achieving the general research, teaching, and professional service missions of the Department, College, and University through organized official duties, committees, Councils, or other advisory groups.

#### B. Assignments of weights

Weights are typically used to reflect the actual distribution of effort between teaching, research, and service for a given faculty member (except that limits are placed on how extreme weights may be to reflect departmental commitment to our research and teaching mission).

For typical faculty members in any given year, the normal expectation is that Teaching and Research will be equally weighted at 40% each and Service weighted 20%; this corresponds to a faculty member who is teaching two courses per semester, and doing a normal and productive amount of research and service. Departures from these weights may be appropriate to accommodate teaching release time because of a grant, increased effort devoted to teaching, sabbaticals, leaves without pay, or an unusual circumstance that warrants a different distribution of the weights in the interest of equity.

Given the system above, a course will typically count as 10% of a faculty member's yearly workload. This allocation will be used by Committee A in assigning weights during the yearly evaluation. If a faculty member taught three courses during the year (instead of four) because grant money provided release from one course, then the appropriate weights would be 30% for teaching, 50% for research, and 20% for service. If a faculty member emphasizes teaching during a given year by teaching three courses each semester (six during the year), then the appropriate weights would be 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service.

To reflect the department's commitment to both teaching and research, certain constraints are defined. Except in unusual circumstances to be negotiated when they occur (i.e., not retrospectively at the time of annual review), the following limits will apply:

	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>
Teaching	.2	.7
Research	.2	.7
Service	.1	.2

Committee A will assign these weights during annual review automatically -- using the amount of teaching as an indicator of the teaching-research tradeoff, and assuming a 20% service load. However, if a faculty member believes the weights do not accurately reflect the distribution of effort, s/he may re-negotiate the distribution with the chair. Under certain circumstances, weights that fall outside the ranges above may be negotiated. Examples in which such re-negotiation of weights would be appropriate include the following: (1) A faculty member is given departmental release time in which to develop and write a grant requesting external funding; (2) A faculty member spends extra time developing a new course during the year; (3) A faculty member is elected or appointed to office in a national professional organization (such as APA or APS) that will take a great deal of extra service time. In such cases, a re-distribution of effort can be anticipated, and should ideally be discussed and resolved with the chair as early as possible. However, Committee A will account for atypical distributions of effort at evaluation time as well, and a faculty member should document such efforts in the annual evaluation information.

The chair and others who have official administrative responsibilities in the department (e.g., the Assistant Chair) may have their service increased above the .2 maximum. All members of the department -- including those with administrative appointments -- are expected to do some teaching and research each year (except during sabbaticals and leaves of absence).

### C. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

College and University policies will be followed with regard to the means of evaluating teaching. The following materials/information may be used to evaluate each faculty member: (1) Student rating of instruction; (2) Course outlines/descriptions or syllabi for each course taught (need only be submitted once and updated as necessary); (3) Distribution of grades for each course; (4) Peer evaluation of teaching (see the section below defining the procedure to be used for Peer evaluation).

Consistent deficiencies in any of the areas listed in the paragraph following this one are evidence of failure to meet minimum standards for teaching. If student ratings and systematic peer evaluation for the five criteria below are unfavorable, it is the instructor's responsibility to provide other evidence bearing out the criteria (e.g., course outlines, exams, notes, special materials, etc.). Documented improvement of any deficiencies in the seven areas listed below will be viewed favorably by Committee A, and will be taken into account for Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Increment decisions.

Evidence of minimally acceptable teaching -- defined for Tenure and promotion as a baseline for evaluating superior teaching -- includes:

- 1) Adequate knowledge of subject areas taught (supporting material includes exams and class notes, and peer review);
- 2) Conduct of research in the instructor's primary teaching area;
- 3) Adequate preparation for classes (possible supporting materials include student ratings and comments, exams and class notes, special materials including hand-outs, slides, demonstrations, or any materials used which require advanced planning and preparation, initiative in seeking self-evaluation and self-improvement -- videotaping class presentations, attendance at teaching workshops, use of standardized evaluation forms administered throughout the semester, etc.);
- 4) Willingness to teach those courses which are essential to the undergraduate and graduate program. (evidence involves degree of participation in essential courses);
- 5) Conscientious participation in advising of students (possible supporting material includes evidence of thorough knowledge of department and college requirements and mastery in advising students; availability for advising during registration periods; and participation in the day-to-day advising process by maintaining regular office hours; note that when the department has a professional staff advisor, faculty can still contribute to the advising activity of the department—e.g., through career advising, or extraordinary efforts; such effort must be carefully documented);
- 6) Creating an environment for learning, and using effective communication that engages students.

The following criteria are to be used for identifying superior teaching for purposes of promotions and annual increments. Note that the concept of superior teaching includes superior performance in the seven areas for minimally acceptable teaching given above. In order to extend those seven areas from "acceptable" to "superior," the following criteria should characterize the

instructor's teaching:

- 1) Creating student interest in subject material (possible supporting material includes unsolicited student commendations to the Chair or College Administration, documented when possible; and the development of high-quality new courses and/or innovative changes that improve current courses);
- 2) Developing new courses for improving the undergraduate or graduate curriculum (possible supporting material includes (a) For undergraduate courses, enhancement of or filling gaps in the BA or BS tracks; (b) For graduate courses enhancing or filling gaps in the general-experimental psychology training and/or increasing the employability of students; (c) Popularity of courses -- although popularity, naturally, is not taken as a prima facie evidence of quality or improvement; (d) Student ratings of new courses -- we note that an instructor receiving mediocre ratings in new or revised courses may be as valuable to the Department as one who received high ratings in well-rehearsed, repetitively-offered courses; (e) Other evidence listed above in the paragraph on adequate teaching is also relevant for evaluating new courses);
- 3) Routinely taught courses are up-to-date and well-organized (possible supporting materials include handouts, exams, articles assigned, textbooks, and evidence that research in areas taught is current and up-to-date.
- 4) Extraordinary participation in, or significant contributions to, undergraduate advising. (Supporting materials include innovative advising procedures initiated and indications of success; evidence of participation in advising that goes beyond routine day-to-day advising and quality of scheduled advising during registration periods.)
- 5) Research Education. (Supporting materials include number of MA, MS and PhD students; number of MA, MS, and PhD committees on which faculty member has served; number of undergraduates who have received research training and experience; number of published MA and MS theses and PhD dissertations directed by the faculty member and quality of publication outlet; impact on other faculty and their students; evidence of attempts to obtain external funding or research programs and quality of such efforts.)
- 6) Quality of published textbooks. (Supporting materials include quality judgment of peers; professional reputation of the publisher; the explicit evaluation of the book by students; evidence of the influence of the textbook upon teaching in the discipline nationally.

Each year Committee A may compile information on each faculty member about the following areas:

- 1) Curriculum Development (including number of new courses developed and number of old courses substantially revised);
- 2) Research Education (including number of PhD students, number of MA students, number of graduate committees serve on, and number of undergraduates enrolled in research courses);
- 3) Advising activity (including career and academic advising);
- 4) Participation in required courses (including number of required courses taught and number of required courses revised in a major way).

#### D. Criteria for the Evaluation of Research

The categorization presented below will be used in Committee A's annual review of faculty research activity and in other research evaluation (e.g., promotion and tenure considerations, research award nominations, etc.). The six categories rank various research activities according to several criteria: (1) the amount of effort involved in each; (2) the extent to which they promote the faculty member's attainment of a national reputation in his/her field; (3) the extent to which they promote the department's national reputation by production of scholarly research; (4) the degree to which they contribute to departmental efforts to increase the number of faculty whose research is federally-funded.

##### Category 1:

- 1) Lunch-bunch type presentations;
- 2) Presentations at local or regional meetings;
- 3) Submissions of research articles (Junior faculty only);
- 4) Internal funding;
- 5) Publications in non-refereed journals.

##### Category 2:

- 1) Invited research talks at other academic institutions;
- 2) Book reviews;
- 3) Notes and comments;
- 4) Presentations at National/International meetings.

##### Category 3:

- 1) Publications not included in other categories;
- 2) Invited participation in topical symposia;
- 3) Invited distinguished addresses;
- 4) Submission of Federal Grant Proposals;

##### Category 4:

- 1) Editing a scholarly book;
- 2) Full-length publication in top journals (with credit adjusted for authorship order at Committee A's discretion);
- 3) External awards (for each year of support);
- 4) Invited chapters;

##### Category 5:

- 1) Publication of a classic paper (post-hoc credit);
- 2) Publication of major theoretical and/or integrative paper in a premier journal; i.e., a "break-through" paper;

##### Category 6:

- 1) Authoring a scholarly book.

## E. Criteria for Evaluation of Service

Service shall be evaluated in three broad categories: Professional, University/College, and Departmental. Because of the large student-faculty ratio in Psychology and the continuing development and change of its undergraduate and graduate programs, significant demands are made on many faculty member's time and energy to perform service of direct benefit to the Department's programs. These demands necessarily affect at times a faculty member's performance in Teaching and Research. Consequently, significant contributions in the area of University Governance, as well as Professional Service, are to be evaluated and considered in annual Increment, Tenure, and Promotion decisions. Academic Service to the Department in the form of contributions to improvements in academic programs is viewed as affecting the quality of the total departmental effort in educating students through teaching and research.

Service responsibilities should always be managed to minimize conflicts with the faculty member's responsibilities in teaching and research. Service should be de-emphasized for untenured, tenure-track faculty, minimizing their obligation to serve on Departmental, College, and University committees and councils in order to facilitate career development in teaching and research during the probationary period.

Minimal criteria for Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluations are active and continuing participation in departmental governance through service on committees which develop and/or administrate academic policies, or service as departmental official administering student or faculty concerns.

Types of contributions to each of the three areas of service include the following:

### Professional Service:

- 1) Service by office in relevant professional societies;
- 2) Service participation in the programs of state, regional, national, or international professional meetings ;
- 3) Refereeing or reviewing research papers, chapters, or books submitted for publication, or reviewing of grant proposals;
- 4) Editing professional journals or other publications;
- 5) Participation in a specialized professional capacity related to discipline in programs sponsored by extra-university groups;
- 6) Extra-university service, including talks or presentations related to the discipline to external groups such as schools, colleges, other Universities, churches, and civic organizations (and it should be noted whether remuneration was received);
- 7) Service on local, state, national, or international commissions, advisory boards or agencies, councils (public or private) related to the faculty member's discipline or profession.

### University/College Service:

- 1) Participation on committees, councils, or other advisory groups (and accounting for number of hours per month and/or term of service);
- 2) Special offices;



- 3) The quality of contributions to these activities is relevant and should be documented as well.

Departmental Service:

- 1) Membership on committees or other advisory groups;
- 2) Chairperson of such committees or groups, or coordinator of academic programs;
- 3) Coordinator of a departmental governance (as opposed to academic program) unit;
- 4) Project Director of a Departmental Grant (internal or external);
- 5) Providing faculty mentoring to junior faculty;
- 6) Other special departmental contributions.

Community Service:

Faculty members may submit evidence of exceptional community service; and, faculty may, at the discretion of Committee A, receive service credit for these non-remunerated activities. Examples include:

- 1) Participating in boards, committees, and appointments serving educational, governmental, and therapeutic institutions;
- 2) Providing leadership in community service (e.g., director of a United Way Drive);
- 3) Giving presentations representing professional expertise in the form of free lectures, workshops, etc. to nonprofessional organizations;
- 4) Extending service to agencies or organizations beyond the local level.

F. Peer Review of Teaching

1) Introduction

Goals of the peer review system:

- a) To provide mechanisms to support the constructive feedback from peers that can help improve a faculty member's teaching efforts.
- b) To provide an evaluative process that can be used by Committee A during annual reviews and by the senior faculty during tenure and promotion decisions.

Each goal is supported by a separate process.

2) Peer Review for Constructive Feedback

The Constructive Phase of peer review is conducted by faculty members themselves. Both junior faculty and senior faculty should work to improve their teaching by using interaction with their colleagues (among many other methods). The mechanisms to support this process include:

- a) Inviting colleagues to sit in on class presentations and comment or advise on teaching;
- b) Inviting teaching experts to sit in on class presentations and provide feedback;
- c) Videotaping lectures and asking colleagues/teaching experts to observe those;
- d) Discussing course content with faculty in program area;
- e) Discussing teaching methods with faculty in the university.

Faculty will differ in the value they draw from such exercises. Constructive peer review processes are especially encouraged for all junior faculty and for senior faculty who have documented weaknesses in their teaching. However, all faculty can benefit from such exercises.

Those who engage in such procedures should routinely submit that information to Committee A during annual evaluation as evidence of teaching effort and teaching commitment. In addition, those who support others by providing formal and informal peer review support should submit that information as evidence of teaching effort and teaching commitment.

### 3) Peer Review as Departmental Evaluation of Teaching

The Evaluative Phase of peer review is administered by the Chair/Committee A and is implemented at the beginning of each academic year. Reviewing is routinely conducted during the fall semester (although occasionally spring review may be necessary as well).

Junior faculty are evaluated every year. Senior faculty are evaluated every three years, or more frequently when requested, with a staggered schedule.

Each evaluation is conducted by a three-person evaluation team. One member of the team is nominated by the faculty member being evaluated. The second member is appointed by Committee A. The third person is appointed by Committee A from Committee A. (In unusual circumstances involving, e.g., conflicts of interest, replacements may be negotiated with the Chair.) The Committee A member is responsible for administering and coordinating each evaluation team. No faculty member (except those on Committee A) is expected to serve on more than two evaluation teams in a year.

The evaluation team is responsible for evaluating up to two courses being taught by the evaluated faculty member during the fall semester. Before review begins, members of the evaluation team will meet with the faculty member to identify teaching objectives. For example, while every course should have as one of its objectives the delivery of substantive information (content coverage), some instructors may also place importance on teaching students how to ask scientific questions and to critically evaluate scientific claims. Other instructors may try to infuse students with enthusiasm about the subject, while others may encourage student involvement through free-wheeling discussion. These objectives must be understood by the team.

Following this meeting, there will be evaluative classroom visits three times (with each evaluator visiting at least once) at times mutually acceptable to the faculty member and the evaluation team.

After each member of the team has performed these activities (either separately, or, in many cases, together), preferably by the end of November, the team will produce a report. The report will contain verbal comments relevant to the stated objectives. These comments should be constructive, and this document should be written both to document teaching quality and to provide critical feedback to the faculty member. The document should reflect input of the whole team. Further, quantitative ratings will be defined independently by each of the three team members on a five-point Likert scale (Poor, Below Average, Average, Above Average, Excellent). The mean and median of the three team members' ratings will be computed, and written into the report. The scales on which ratings will be produced include:

(1) Teaching organization; (2) Concern for students; (3) General teaching effort; (4) Quality of lecturing; (5) Success in teaching objectives; (6) Quality of content coverage; (7) General course management; (8) Overall teaching effectiveness.

A copy of the report will be immediately given to the faculty member being reviewed, and the report will be placed into the personnel file (and will be used in annual evaluation). The faculty member may write a response, which will also be placed into the personnel file. Questions of procedural impropriety and issues of fairness will be resolved by the members of Committee A not on the evaluation team.

#### G. Departmental and Professional Citizenship

The Department of Psychology also values activities that contribute to the missions of the department, but that may not be easily included in the traditional areas of research, teaching, and service. All faculty are expected to participate in the academic activities of the department and to constructively work in a professional manner with others in ways that benefit students, faculty colleagues, the department, the university, and the discipline. Such activity can influence the faculty member's overall performance evaluation. Faculty members will be provided an opportunity to respond to the evaluation provided by the chair and Committee A before it becomes final.

#### H. Breadth of coverage of criteria

The general philosophy, the weights assigned to teaching, research, and service, and the policies regarding assignment to these roles apply to all faculty who hold appointment in the Department. Although normally faculty join the Department through a recruiting process involving a national search, faculty who become members of the Department through other avenues will be subject to the same Faculty Personnel Policies. Thus, for example, faculty who might come into the Department via a transfer from another unit/appointment within the University are governed by the policies set forth in this document.

### **III. Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Evaluations**

#### A. General Philosophy

The Department of Psychology embraces the position that the primary characteristics which distinguish the role of a psychology faculty member in a University from a four-year college or lower institution are graduate level instruction and the quantity and quality of creative research and scholarship. Promotion, tenure, and annual evaluation decisions in the Department of Psychology shall be made primarily on the basis of contributions in Teaching and Research. Interdisciplinary research is particularly valued by the university, and faculty involved in such research should work with the chair to define explicit evaluation procedures to account for such effort. In individual cases, extraordinary contributions in the area of Service, when well documented and agreed upon in advance, may be weighted equally with Teaching or Research, but not to the exclusion of either of the latter.

In such cases, Service should represent a significant contribution to either the Department or the University in order to be fully or partially exchanged for Teaching and Research. Presumably such Service, if significant, will affect the Teaching and/or Research of the faculty member and may also positively impact the department's total teaching and research effort. Service done for financial remuneration is not likely to make a significant contribution to the Department or the University.

In any particular year, through prior negotiation with the Chairperson and Committee A, a faculty member may negotiate a change in the equal weights applied to Teaching and Research. Such a circumstance might occur if a faculty member is involved in developing new courses or in time consuming grant proposal development, an extraordinary series of research projects, or a heavy load of supervision of graduate student research (see the section on "Weights" above).

#### B. Criteria for Annual Salary Increments

For annual salary increments, regardless of rank, the decision will be made on the basis of quantity and quality of contributions to teaching, research, and service (particularly University governance) since the last budgeting period. At higher ranks, professional service contributions will be expected to become increasingly evident. Teaching and Research will be weighted equally, but an individual faculty member may, through prior discussion with Committee A and the Chair, negotiate the weighting of Service against Teaching and Research as a salary advancement criterion in a given year.

#### C. Annual and Cumulative Review of Progress toward Tenure; Reappointment of Probationary Faculty

Consistent with college guidelines, a separate assessment of cumulative progress toward tenure will be provided to tenure-track faculty each year. The general guidelines for evaluation of teaching, research, and service will be applied to such evaluation. Each year, the results of this evaluation will be provided to the tenure-track faculty member by letter. The faculty member has the right to meet with Committee A before the letter is forwarded to the dean; this meeting may be necessary to address issues of clarification, accuracy, or fairness. If issues remain following this meeting, the faculty member may write a letter to accompany the evaluation letter. The progress-toward-tenure letter is sent to the dean with the annual evaluation information for the whole department (unless the dean's timing and organization require otherwise). In addition, a more complete progress-toward-tenure assessment will be given each tenure-track faculty member during the third year. Committee A and the chair establish guidelines for this third year evaluation procedure. A vote by the tenured faculty on re-appointment of the candidate will be a part of the third-year evaluation procedure; tenured faculty must be provided copies of the vita, reprints, teaching evaluations, and other supporting material to inform their voting on reappointment.

#### D. Criteria for Promotions

For promotion to Associate Professor, the cumulative record of performance in Teaching and Research shall, in general, be weighted equally.

For promotion to Professor, the cumulative record of Teaching and Research shall again be equally weighted, but Service (particularly Professional Service) shall be given increased emphasis. The record of research shall be evaluated by external peers at institutions of comparable academic excellence and should show sustained achievement and increasing recognition by external peers in terms of its quality and impact on the body of knowledge of the specialty. The record of Teaching shall be expected to show quality of achievement at least as great as that demonstrated at the time attainment of the rank of Associate Professor. An increasing record of significant Service contributions to the discipline (i.e., Professional Service) should be evident.

#### E. Criteria for Tenure

The long-term priorities and needs of the department shall be weighted in tenure decisions, as well as an individual's contributions in teaching, research, and service. For tenure decisions, quality performance in both Teaching and Research are essential criteria at any rank, and the two shall be weighted equally. At the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, Service (particularly in University Governance) must be of substantial quality and quantity, but is clearly secondary to Teaching and Research. At the professor level, Service in University Governance must be complemented by Professional Service to the discipline. Newly hired faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor shall be evaluated for Tenure, in addition, on the basis of evaluations by external peers in regard to the quality and quantity of research achievement.

### **IV. Departmental Voting Procedures**

#### A. Committee A Elections

1. General Principle: Committee A is the body elected by the faculty to engage in evaluation and departmental policy making. As such, the two Committee A members should be voted on by those on the faculty who are formally evaluated by Committee A on a consistent basis.

2. Eligibility: All tenured Associate or Full Professors of the Department of Psychology are eligible to serve on Committee A, as long as membership is consistent with university nepotism policies.

3. Nomination procedure: The outgoing member of Committee A runs the nomination and election procedure. (In the event that this person is not present to run the election, the continuing member of Committee A will do so.) During the week before the first faculty meeting of the fall semester, this "election administrator" (EA) will announce by departmental memo the Committee A election time and will solicit nominations. Eligible faculty on leave or sabbatical will be contacted directly by the EA. Nominators should obtain permission of nominees before submitting their names to the EA. Approximately 24 hours prior to the first faculty meeting of the fall semester the EA will publicize by departmental memo those who have been nominated. Faculty will be permitted to nominate additional individuals at the faculty meeting and discussion of the nominees will be encouraged. Nominations will not be accepted after this meeting and a secret ballot will be distributed to all eligible faculty as soon as possible after the meeting. A "good faith" effort will be made by the EA to insure that faculty on leave or sabbatical have an opportunity to

vote. Ballots are to be returned to the EA no later than four working days after they are distributed.

4. Voting eligibility: All permanent tenure and tenure-track Psychology faculty with appointments of .50 FTE or greater (including faculty on sabbatical) are eligible to vote. Absentee voters who meet this requirement are eligible (and in fact encouraged) to vote. The EA will make reasonable effort to contact all faculty who are eligible to obtain their votes. However, the burden for casting a Committee A ballot rests with the faculty member, and blame will not be placed on the EA for the failure of any faculty member to cast a ballot. Each eligible faculty member receives exactly one vote, and proxies will not be accepted. Absentee ballot must be cast by direct communication between the EA and the voter; votes communicated through a second party will not be accepted.

5. Voting procedure: A majority elects a new Committee A member. In the case of ties or no majority, a run-off of the top two vote-getters will be organized by the EA, and all original voting faculty must be given a chance to vote in the run-off, either during a special faculty meeting or by direct communication with the EA. The EA and the chair will count ballots. An additional tie will be resolved by a coin flip conducted by the EA in the presence of the chair; the candidates are entitled to attend the coin flip if they desire.

#### B. Tenure, Promotion, and Re-appointment Votes

1. General Principle: The departmental vote is a critical part of the process of granting tenure, promotion, and re-appointment. The tenured faculty should make tenure, promotion, and re-appointment decisions at the departmental level. These decisions then become advisory to the higher-level administrative processes.

2. Voting procedure: The chair will administer the departmental procedures connected with tenure, promotion, and re-appointment. The meeting at which such votes will be taken will be announced by departmental memo at least 24 hours in advance.

3. Voting eligibility: All tenured permanent Psychology faculty with appointments of .50 FTE or greater (including faculty on sabbatical) are eligible to vote. Absentee voters who meet this requirement are eligible (and in fact encouraged) to vote. The chair will normally make reasonable effort to contact all faculty who are eligible but who do not attend the election to obtain their votes. However, the burden for casting a tenure, promotion, or re-appointment ballot rests with the faculty member. Each eligible faculty member receives exactly one vote, cast as a secret ballot. Proxies will not be accepted. Absentee ballot must be cast by direct communication between the chair and the voter; "word of mouth" votes will not be acceptable in any circumstance.

#### C. Hiring Decisions

1. General principle: Hiring broadly affects all faculty and graduate students. The department's vote is advisory to the chair. However, it is expected that typically the Chair (in consultation with Committee A) will follow the department's voting decisions in proceeding with

hiring activity. In circumstances when the Chair chooses to disregard the Department's vote in making a hiring recommendation to the Dean, the Chair must inform both the Departmental faculty (by memo or during a faculty meeting) and the Dean of the discrepancy between that recommendation and the Department's vote.

2. Voting procedure: The chair will administer the voting procedure concerning hiring. The meeting will be announced by departmental memo at least 24 hours in advance.

3. Faculty voting eligibility: All permanent tenure or tenure-track Psychology faculty with appointments of .50 FTE or greater (including faculty on sabbatical) are eligible to vote. Votes should not be cast unless the faculty member has reviewed files and/or been present for interviews. Faculty who wish to review files should be so accommodated following a request to the Chair. Faculty who expect to miss the meeting where hiring votes are taken may register a vote with the Chair, and the burden rests on the faculty member to register the vote. Proxies will not be accepted. Absentee ballot must be cast by direct communication between the chair and the voter; "word of mouth" votes will not be acceptable in any circumstance.

4. Student voting eligibility: The graduate students as a body are eligible to cast one vote in the hiring process. The graduate student representative (appointed to the search committee by the Chair) is expected to administer well in advance of the faculty meeting a written balloting procedure to all full-time graduate students, and is bound to vote according to the plurality of all graduate students in the first ballot. In the case of multiple ballots, the graduate student representative is a free delegate.

#### D. Routine Votes Taken During Faculty Meetings

1. General principles: Since such votes are informed by the discussion that occurs at the meetings, those attending the meeting are best able to engage in informed voting. Such votes are technically advisory to the Chair/Committee A, although the department expects its votes to be followed by the Chair/Committee A. In cases in which the departmental votes are not followed by the Chair/Committee A, all faculty members of the department will be so informed through memo or during a faculty meeting.

2. Voting procedure: The chair will administer routine voting procedures.

3. Voting eligibility: All permanent Psychology faculty with appointment of .50 FTE or greater who are present at the faculty meeting will be eligible to vote. In cases where a faculty member feels well-informed and anticipates that a vote will be taken in her/his absence, an absentee vote may be registered with the Chair. The burden is totally on the faculty member to register such a vote. It is within the purview of the Chair to decide that the issue has changed, or that discussion has occurred, to invalidate an absentee vote. Thus, to insure a vote, a faculty member must be present at the faculty meeting in which it occurs.

## **V. Department Research Professor Personnel Policy**

### **Requirements for Appointment of Research Professors**

The Department of Psychology supports the appointment of individuals as Research Professors. A Research Professor appointment is viewed as a way of enriching the Department within the context of a mutually supportive and productive relationship. The appointment of Research Professors to the faculty ought to be for purposes of enhancing the mission of the department. The hiring process for Research Professors will follow the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook for temporary faculty.

In most cases, candidates for the position of Research Professor are individuals who will work at or near full-time on funded research, which will be their primary source of financial support. The nature of these appointments and the arrangements for support may vary considerably. For example, some appointments may arise in a subordinate context as a need to support the ongoing research of an existing full-time faculty member. Other appointments may originate as a function of co-equal, collaborative efforts between an existing, full-time, faculty member and an individual who may or may not be of equivalent academic rank or experience. In addition, appointments also may be of a “stand-alone” nature in which the individual provides unique capabilities to the department and is funded solely by their independently-generated external support. In any case, all appointments to Research professor positions within the Department will be conducted as follows:

#### **Recruitment and Appointment:**

- 1) Pursuant to the Faculty Handbook regulations on Research Faculty appointments, policies for recruiting and hiring will follow those procedures specified for temporary faculty appointments.
- 2) It will be the responsibility of the Chair and Committee A to negotiate any unique details of each appointment and make recommendations for the Research Professorship appointment to the faculty. This may be done in collaboration with other members of the faculty who are directly involved with the research effort of the Research Professor candidate.
- 3) The Chair and Committee A will propose rank (Assistant, Associate, of Full Professor) and compensation level, assuming rank will reflect appropriate correspondence to those with comparable levels of academic experience and productivity. Proposed salary level also will reflect comparable market value, however, the proposed salary may or may not be comparable to academic market values. The proposed, as well as the ongoing, salary level also may be subject to or mediated by funding availability and the policies of the funding agency. In no case is the Department responsible for providing any portion of the financial support of the Research Professor. However, at any time, the Department may agree to provide support or be petitioned to do so.
- 4) The faculty will follow voting procedures as they would for any faculty appointment.

#### **Responsibilities:**

- 1) The major responsibilities of the Research Professor will be defined at the time of appointment. These responsibilities will be typically to support the specific research projects that provide the funding that supports the Research Professor. However, they also may vary by mutual agreement.



- 2) The Research Professor will be extended the privileges of any faculty member in the Department with regard to their involvement in Departmental activities. However, Research Faculty will be restricted in their voting in the same manner as visiting or adjunct faculty, that is, they will refrain from voting on issues with long-term implications for the Department, policy matters, and personnel issues.
- 3) Expanded involvement in Departmental activities by Research Faculty, such as teaching, mentoring, working with graduate students, etc., is encouraged. However, it must be recognized that such activities must not interfere with the Research faculty member's primary responsibilities. Often such activities are a part of a Research Professor's primary responsibilities, e.g., supervising, and therefore, teaching/mentoring graduate students in the process. However, when such activities clearly extend beyond the primary responsibilities of the Research Professor, the activities need to be negotiated with the Chair, and in some cases, be compensated by the Department.

**Evaluation:**

1) In general, Research Faculty members will be evaluated for annual increments in salary and for advancement in rank with the same criteria used for evaluating all faculty members as delineated in the Department Personnel Policy. Obviously, certain exceptions may have to be made for a variety of factors, such as weights in relationship to the responsibility assigned the Research Professor, and by factors related to the funding source. These factors may vary in detail from the prescribed principles applied to regular full-time, tenure-track faculty (e.g., minimum weights, etc.) However, the general nature and spirit of the evaluation will be consistent with that applied to regular faculty members.

## **VI. Requirements for Adjunct Appointments**

Adjunct status can be granted to individuals in the following categories:

- 1) PhD's who teach in the Psychology Department on a regular basis.
- 2) Recognized scholars in Psychology or related disciplines who contribute to the education of students through offering research experience, seminars, service on thesis and dissertation committees, and other educational opportunities.
- 3) Ex-psychology faculty who are serving on Masters and Doctoral Committees formed before the faculty member left the university.

In order to obtain adjunct title, an eligible person must be approved yearly by a vote of the faculty with respect to the adjunct status and rank within status.

## **VII. Departmental Release-Time Policy**

A. For grant support: Any substantial grant supporting basic research merits one course release per year of funding. If release time is provided by the funding agency, the PI would have the option of SRI return or deferred release.

B. For beginning tenure track faculty: If the faculty member has a full probationary period, s/he shall be granted two course releases prior to tenure. (One of these course releases is for the

first semester, and the second is to be used sometime after the sixth semester at the choice of the faculty member and with approval of the Chair.) If the new faculty member has an abbreviated probationary period, then one course-release during the first semester of employment will be granted.

### **VIII. Canceling Courses due to Low Student Demand**

- A. If a course is under-enrolled, the Chair can decide to continue the class.
- B. If a class is canceled, there are three options open to the instructor:
  - 1) One of the larger undergraduate courses -- 1113, 1193, 2113, 2743, 3503, etc. -- can be divided to produce two smaller sections; one of these would be taught by the instructor of the canceled class.
  - 2) Release time may be given, and the instructor will teach 3 courses in the next regular semester.
  - 3) If the instructor has been rated in the top two categories of research for the past three years, s/he may apply to the Chair for release time for research and/or proposal writing.

### **IX. Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership**

- A. Levels of Graduate Faculty Membership

The standard Graduate College categories of Graduate Faculty membership are:

M0: May teach graduate courses

M1: M1 members may teach graduate courses and be a member, or a director of Master's committees;

M2: In addition to M1 status, M2 members may serve on doctoral committees;

M3: In addition to M2 status, M3 members may direct Doctoral dissertations.

We believe that the distinguishing feature of membership should be whether or not a faculty member is able to supervise research at the Master's or Doctoral levels.

- B. M3 Membership Criteria

In order to be eligible for M3 membership, one must meet the M1 criteria and, in at least the last five-year period:

- 1) Publish two inquiries in one or more of the following three areas:
  - a) refereed journal
  - b) scholarly book
  - c) chapter in a scholarly book

AND

- 2) Earn two units from the following:
- a) research-related service (such as serving as an editor or a member of an editorial board, regular reviewing of journal articles, reviewing grant proposals for external agencies, etc.), OR
  - b) research presentation at a national meeting, OR
  - c) receipt of approval of a grant proposal, OR
  - d) publication in recognized non-refereed journals, OR
  - e) repetition of activities in 1) above (one unit per additional activity).\*

C. M2 Membership Criteria

In addition to meeting the M1 criteria, one must, in a five year period, show activity in at least two of the areas listed in 1) and 2) in Part B above.

D. M1 Membership Criteria

M1 membership is accorded to those who have earned the PhD in psychology, or a related area, and have published three research articles in refereed journals.

E. Change in Status

An upgrade in Graduate Faculty status may be attained by written application to the Departmental Graduate Faculty Committee. A change in status can be granted at such time as the faculty member has met the criteria for the rank desired. Ordinarily, a faculty member will be allowed to direct a graduate student's Masters Thesis if the faculty member was an M1 (M2 or M3) member when the student chose her/him as major professor.

F. New Faculty

New faculty will be admitted to the graduate faculty at the M2 (or M3 status if qualified) level at the time that they have produced two research articles in refereed journals. After admission to the Graduate Faculty, new faculty will be reviewed on the same five-year schedule as old faculty.

\* Decisions concerning whether the criteria in Part B 1) and 2) above have been met will be made by the Departmental Graduate Faculty Committee (Committee A). In order for a book to qualify as "scholarly," it ordinarily should be more advanced than the introductory, undergraduate level and have a purpose beyond that of enhancing the income of the author. Exceptions to this policy can be made by appeal to the Departmental Graduate Faculty committee.

## **X. Evaluation of the Chair**

The evaluation of the chair proceeds according to the statement in the Faculty Handbook (updated in July, 1993): "Chairs will be evaluated annually by their dean and departmental faculty. Committee A (excluding the chair) shall prepare an annual evaluation of the chair's teaching, research/creative activity and service (other than departmental administration) using the standard process and forms for faculty evaluations. For evaluating the administrative effectiveness of the chair, Committee A should solicit formal input from the entire faculty and staff of the unit. These evaluations, together with the dean's evaluation of the chair's performance, will be discussed with the chair and will be used by the dean as the basis for determining the chair's salary increase."

For reappointment: "Approximately 12 months before the end of the chair's term, elected members of Committee A shall initiate the proceedings to obtain a formal recommendation from the faculty concerning the reappointment of the chair and transmit it to the dean. If the dean does not concur with the department faculty's recommendation, the dean will meet with the department faculty to discuss reasons for disagreement. However, the final decision for reappointment shall be made by the dean."

## **XI. Mentoring Policy**

New faculty face special difficulties, including learning departmental procedures, supporting teaching activities, understanding departmental and university expectations (some of which are unstated), establishing scholarly collaboration, mastering a complex university system, and obtaining research funding. Some of these difficulties can impede professional success and job satisfaction. Occasionally formal and informal policies are inconsistent, and views about acceptable collegial relations and responsibilities are often left unstated. Recognizing these difficulties, the Department of Psychology has a mentoring policy to provide specific assistance to support the integration of new faculty into the privileges and responsibilities of being on the OU faculty.

It is the responsibility of mentors to ease the adjustment and to maximize the potential of each new faculty member. Mentors are successful, tenured faculty that the Chair feels will most closely meet the needs of new faculty. Mentors acting in their mentorship role are non-evaluative. Their role is to assist, support, advise, and encourage. Beyond this, the exact duties of mentors are left open to provide flexibility for individual needs. Besides interpreting written and unwritten policy, mentors may agree to offer instructional advice, and they may review grant proposals and manuscripts prior to submission. A mentor appointment is not necessarily permanent. If either party concludes at any time that a change is advisable, the Chair will appoint a new mentor. In any case, the mentor's duties will gradually decline as the new faculty member nears tenure and promotion. Typically, the mentorship relationship is used to support new Assistant Professors, although mentors may also be useful for and may be appointed for new faculty in more senior positions (although in the latter case, the mentor's role is more involved with information about the university and department's rules and procedures than with manuscript evaluation and career support, and will typically be phased out within a year or so).

## **XII. Reappointment of Untenured Faculty**

Within the guidelines of the University and College, the Chair/Committee A will call for a vote of tenured faculty regarding annual reappointment of each full-time faculty during the probationary period. This vote will be forwarded to the Dean in the department's recommendation letter.

## **XIII. Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, and Affirmative Action Policies**

The Department of Psychology strongly supports the University of Oklahoma's affirmative action goals and condemns any action that would treat individuals unfairly, especially actions that are based on race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation. Moreover, the Department strives to create a working environment for students, staff, and faculty that embodies both the letter and the spirit of the principles that underlie affirmative action and general fairness. To this end, each faculty member of the Department of Psychology holds special responsibilities to be aware of and to comply with Federal laws and University of Oklahoma policy pertaining to individual rights and liberties. These obligations pertain to equitable treatment in hiring practices, student evaluations, admission of students, and evaluation of faculty. These laws absolutely prohibit: (1) Discrimination on the basis of race and color, ethnic or national origin, sex, creed, religion, age, or physical disability (see Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and the Americans With Disabilities Act of Congress, 1992); (2) Sexual harassment of students, staff, and faculty. Each faculty member shall hold special responsibility to actively support the department as an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

## **XIV. Family Leave Policy**

In accordance with university policy, absences for family leave may be taken for any one of the following reasons:

- (1) Following the birth of a child to the employee and in order to care for the child;
- (2) Following the adoption or placement in foster care of a child by the employee, in order to care for this child;
- (3) To enable the employee to care for a spouse, dependent, or parent who has a serious health condition.

University policy mandates that a period of 12 weeks be allowed for family leave. However, it is envisioned that under all but the most exceptional circumstances, members of the faculty will be given the period of a full semester for family leave.

Evaluation: During the course of any leave without pay for non-academic reasons, the annual evaluation process shall proceed in such a way that the faculty member's annual evaluation rating for the year in which the leave is taken is based only on that time spent actively in the department. The evaluation procedures for the year encompassing the period of family leave will be sensitive to the fact that the time both pre and post leave will also have been affected. The annual evaluation rating and associated salary increases shall not be negatively affected by the period of absence. Annual evaluation ratings for periods of absence greater than a single semester (such that the faculty member cannot be evaluated on their academic performance for that year) shall revert to the

mean of the preceding two years. At the time of the annual evaluation, it is the responsibility of the faculty member who has taken family leave to describe the impact this period of leave has had on the performance of their duties.

#### **XV. Status of This Document**

This document is considered to be the official statement of policy for the Department of Psychology. The University of Oklahoma Faculty Handbook states official policy of the university. Policies stated in the Faculty Handbook supersede those in this document unless it is explicitly stated that those policies in the Faculty Handbook are being adjusted in the Departmental policy statement and those adjustments are not inconsistent with university policy. Individual or groups of Psychology faculty can always suggest policy changes, or request attention from the faculty to consider policy changes. We recognize that a departmental policy document is by nature a dynamic and evolving document, one that can be improved with experience and that must respond to and reflect changes in departmental, college, and university governance.

*OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST  
The University Of Oklahoma  
Norman Campus*

=====

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Kirby Gilliland, Department of Psychology

FROM: Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost

DATE: January 15, 1998

SUBJECT: Proposed tenure and promotion criteria



I am pleased to approve the Department of Psychology's proposed tenure and promotion criteria as transmitted to this office on November 19, 1997.

Periodic revision of these guidelines is an arduous but important task. I extend thanks to everyone in the department who contributed to the process.

NLM/gmh

cc: Dean Paul Bell  
Connie Hamilton

JAN 03 2000

OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST  
The University Of Oklahoma  
Norman Campus

=====

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Dr. Kirby Gilliland, Chair, Department of Psychology

FROM: Nancy L. Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost

DATE: December 17, 1999

SUBJECT: Proposed research faculty guidelines

I am pleased to approve the research faculty appointment and evaluation guidelines as proposed by Committee A and ratified by the faculty on December 1, 1999. I extend thanks to everyone in the department who contributed to the process.

cc: ✓Dean Paul Bell  
Ms. Connie Hamilton



## Proposed change in Department of Psychology Personnel Policy

Proposed 11-9-99

*Rationale: Committee A recommends that the following statement regarding the appointment of Research Professors be placed into the Department Personnel Policy. This statement would be placed just prior to the section on "Requirements for Adjunct Appointments."*

### Requirements for Appointment of Research Professors

The Department of Psychology supports the appointment of individuals as Research Professors. A Research Professor appointment is viewed as a way of enriching the Department within the context of a mutually supportive and productive relationship. The appointment of Research Professors to the faculty ought to be for purposes of enhancing the mission of the department. The hiring process for Research Professors will follow the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook for temporary faculty.

In most cases, candidates for the position of Research Professor are individuals who will work at or near full-time on funded research, which will be their primary source of financial support. The nature of these appointments and the arrangements for support may vary considerably. For example, some appointments may arise in a subordinate context as a need to support the ongoing research of an existing full-time faculty member. Other appointments may originate as a function of co-equal, collaborative efforts between an existing, full-time, faculty member and an individual who may or may not be of equivalent academic rank or experience. In addition, appointments also may be of a "stand-alone" nature in which the individual provides unique capabilities to the department and is funded solely by their independently-generated external support. In any case, all appointments to Research professor positions within the Department will be conducted as follows:

#### Recruitment and Appointment:

- 1) Pursuant to the Faculty Handbook regulations on Research Faculty appointments, policies for recruiting and hiring will follow those procedures specified for temporary faculty appointments.
- 2) It will be the responsibility of the Chair and Committee A to negotiate any unique details of each appointment and make recommendations for the Research Professorship appointment to the faculty. This may be done in collaboration with other members of the faculty who are directly involved with the research effort of the Research Professor candidate.
- 3) The Chair and Committee A will propose rank (Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor) and compensation level, assuming rank will reflect appropriate correspondence to those with comparable levels of academic experience and productivity. Proposed salary level also will reflect comparable market value, however, the proposed salary may or may not be comparable to academic market values. The proposed, as well as the ongoing, salary level also may be subject to or mediated by funding availability and the policies of the funding agency. In no case is the Department responsible for providing any portion of the financial support of the Research Professor. However, at any time, the Department may agree to provide support or be petitioned to do so.
- 4) The faculty will follow voting procedures as they would for any faculty appointment.

#### Responsibilities:

- 1) The major responsibilities of the Research Professor will be defined at the time of appointment. These responsibilities will be typically to support the specific research projects that provide the funding that supports the Research Professor. However, they also may vary by mutual agreement.
- 2) The Research Professor will be extended the privileges of any faculty member in the Department with regard to their involvement in Departmental activities. However, Research Faculty will be restricted in their voting in the same manner as visiting or adjunct faculty, that is, they will refrain from voting on issues with long-term implications for the Department, policy matters, and personnel issues.
- 3) Expanded involvement in Departmental activities by Research Faculty, such as teaching, mentoring, working with graduate students, etc., is encouraged. However, it must be recognized that such activities must not interfere with the Research faculty member's primary responsibilities. Often such activities are a part of a Research Professor's primary responsibilities, e.g., supervising, and therefore, teaching/mentoring graduate students in the process. However, when such activities clearly extend beyond the primary responsibilities of the Research Professor, the activities need to be negotiated with the Chair, and in some cases, be compensated by the Department.

#### Evaluation:

- 1) In general, Research Faculty members will be evaluated for annual increments in salary and for advancement in rank with the same criteria used for evaluating all faculty members as delineated in the Department Personnel Policy. Obviously, certain exceptions may have to be made for a variety of factors, such as weights in relationship to the responsibility assigned the Research Professor, and by factors related to the funding source. These factors may vary in detail from the prescribed principles applied to regular full-time, tenure-track faculty (e.g., minimum weights, etc.) However, the general nature and spirit of the evaluation will be consistent with that applied to regular faculty members.

## Proposed change in Department of Psychology Personnel Policy

Proposed 11-9-99

Rationale: *Committee A requests that the following changes be made to Peer Review of Teaching section of the Department Personnel Policy. The changes below reflect the experience and difficulties Committee A has had with implementing this policy and the demands it places on the faculty. The changes are aimed at reducing the evaluation team to two people (instead of the current three) and at simplifying the evaluation accordingly.*

### F. Peer Review of Teaching

#### 1) Introduction

Goals of the peer review system:

- a) To provide mechanisms to support the constructive feedback from peers that can help improve a faculty member's teaching efforts.
- b) To provide an evaluative process that can be used by **Chair/Committee A** during annual reviews and by the senior faculty during tenure and promotion decisions.

Each goal is supported by a separate process.

#### 2) Peer Review for Constructive Feedback

The Constructive Phase of peer review is conducted by faculty members themselves. Both junior faculty and senior faculty should work to improve their teaching by using interaction with their colleagues (among many other methods). The mechanisms to support this process include:

- a) Inviting colleagues to sit in on class presentations and comment or advise on teaching;
- b) Inviting teaching experts to sit in on class presentations and provide feedback;
- c) Videotaping lectures and asking colleagues/teaching experts to observe those;
- d) Discussing course content with faculty in program area;
- e) Discussing teaching methods with faculty in the university.

Faculty will differ in the value they draw from such exercises. Constructive peer review processes are especially encouraged for all junior faculty and for senior faculty who have documented weaknesses in their teaching. However, all faculty can benefit from such exercises. Those who engage in such procedures should routinely submit that information to Chair/Committee A during annual evaluation as evidence of teaching effort and teaching commitment. In addition, those who support others by providing formal and informal peer review support should submit that information as evidence of teaching effort and teaching commitment.

#### 3) Peer Review as Departmental Evaluation of Teaching

The Evaluative Phase of peer review is administered by the **Chair/Committee A** (~~in this section, "Committee A" refers to the chair and the two elected members~~), and is implemented at the beginning of each academic year. Reviewing is routinely conducted during the fall semester (although occasionally spring review may be necessary as well).