

**Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Guidelines**  
**Psychology Department**  
**San José State University**

APPROVED BY VOTE OF THE TENURED AND PROBATIONARY FACULTY (17 APPROVE, 0 DO NOT APPROVE, 0 ABSTAIN) ON FEBRUARY 23, 2018.

The purpose of these guidelines are to assist RTP committees and administrators outside of the Psychology Department in understanding the activities and professional standards appropriate to our discipline. Generally speaking, the S15-8 policy on Criteria and Standards for **Academic Assignment** and **Service** adequately capture the evaluation of effectiveness in these areas for psychology faculty. With regard to **Academic Assignment**, in this document we describe typical faculty academic assignments, departmental evaluation practices, and highlight high-impact practices central to our departmental mission. We also describe synergistic practices and accomplishments. The bulk of these guidelines describe how **Scholarship and Professional Achievements** in psychology are evaluated with respect to the general policy language in S15-8.

Consistent with S15-7, these guidelines are inclusive. They provide a sense of “typical” activities, evaluative processes, and evaluative criteria in the categories of achievement for our discipline. They are not exclusive; the department recognizes that there are many ways for faculty to make meaningful contributions to students, department, college, and university, and to achieve significant accomplishments that may not be captured in these guidelines. These will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

### **Departmental Context**

The Mission of the department is to engage in the discovery of knowledge about the biological, psychological, and sociocultural processes that affect behavior and to share that knowledge with our students and the scholarly community. The Department integrates undergraduate and graduate education, teaching, research, applied training, and service activities to further the overall mission of the University.

Across all of its programs, the Psychology Department serves over 1300 majors. The Psychology Department offers two undergraduate degrees (BA, Psychology; BS Psychology), and three graduate degrees (MA, Research and Experimental Psychology; MS, Clinical Psychology [accredited by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences]; MS, Industrial/Organizational Psychology). We also offer minors in Human Systems Integration and Psychology. Psychology faculty also participate in the interdisciplinary MS Human Factors/Ergonomics program and the minor in Applied Computing for the Behavioral and Social Science.

In addition to serving our majors, the Psychology department contributes to the education of students across the university through its general education offerings. Lower division offerings include: General Psychology (Psyc 001, Area D1), Identity Development and Prejudice (Psyc 002Q, Area D1), Child and Adolescent Psychology (Psyc 082, Area D1), and Elementary Statistics

(Stat 095, Area B4). Upper division offering include: Writing Workshop (Psyc 100W, Area Z), and Psychology of Prejudice (Psyc 191, Area S).

Tenured and tenure-track faculty typically teach a mix of undergraduate and graduate-level classes.

### **Synergistic Practices and Accomplishments**

**Student mentoring.** Mentoring students in the scientific research process fits Policy S15-7's definition of synergistic as "practices and accomplishments that span more than one category of achievement."

- In terms of academic assignment, faculty may teach research methods and statistics courses, as well as individualized study classes, that involve research mentoring inside the classroom. See **I. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment** for additional information.
- In terms of service, providing research experiences and mentoring *outside of the classroom* constitutes service to students as defined in S15-8, 2.4.2.1 ("Service to students. Advising, mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance student success that are not subsumed in teaching or the primary academic assignment.").
- Finally, the mentoring experience may contribute to a faculty member's scholarly or professional achievements. For example, the projects that students contribute to may result in conference presentations or publications for the faculty member. Students may also be co-authors on these presentations and publications. See **II. Evaluation of Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement** for additional information

**Consultation.** Some forms of consulting work may be synergistic. Providing expertise may constitute a service to the profession (S15-8, 2.4.2.4). If the consultation results in a tangible product related to scholarship (e.g., technical report, policy paper, workplace or community intervention), then it may also constitute SAPA. Some consulting projects may involve students, which the department recognizes as a synergistic practice. See **II. Evaluation of Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement** for additional information.

## **I. Evaluation of Effectiveness in Academic Assignment**

Evaluating whether courses taught are well-crafted and appropriate for the catalog description can be evidenced in several ways, including Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) quantitative scores, subjective feedback, and peer observations. It is standard practice in our department that SOTEs for all Fall and Spring classes are included in RTP evaluations. Regarding peer observations, the department has developed and used, with periodic revision, a standard reporting form. According to departmental policy adopted in Fall 2013, tenured and tenure-track faculty receive one direct observation per year until seven years after hire, across the full range of courses taught. Following the seventh year, direct observations will occur every three years for all faculty until full professorship is reached. Candidates for promotion to full professor must have at least two different courses observed. Upon promotion to full professor, direct observations will occur upon request for post-tenure review. The Chair, RTP committee, or a faculty member can request additional direct observations at any point.

Should any concerns be identified in student evaluations, peer observations, or other performance evaluations, it is important that the candidate explicitly articulate specific actions taken to address these concerns, as this demonstrates the candidate's commitment to improving her or his teaching effectiveness.

**High Impact Practices.** Psychology faculty engage in a variety of high impact practices, and one that is a central feature of our department is the degree to which faculty involve students in scholarly activity, both inside and outside the classroom. Some faculty may teach research methodology and statistics courses at the undergraduate or graduate level. This practice may also include specialized mentoring such as individualized study, directed readings, and applied fieldwork experience (Psyc 180,184,186, or 298).

Outside of teaching research methods and statistics courses, tenured and tenure-track faculty may involve students in their research and scholarly activity, allowing students to advance their knowledge and skills and make first hand contributions to the science of psychology. These experiences prepare students for a variety of post baccalaureate experiences in the workplace and graduate school by developing skills crucial for success in the workplace.

## **II. Evaluation of Scholarly, Artistic, or Professional Achievement**

Faculty members of the Department of Psychology are expected to actively engage in research, scholarly, or creative activities (RSCA) that regularly result in *scholarly, artistic, and/or professional achievements* (SAPA). To remain consistent with the terminology used in RTP policy S15-8, this document uses SAPA to refer to the products (results, outcomes, accomplishments, etc.) of RSCA. This document describes categories of SAPA with representative examples and criteria that the university and Department of Psychology may use to evaluate SAPA

The department expects that faculty will engage in meaningful SAPA throughout their careers, but we consider each case on its own merits. The departmental RTP Committee takes a holistic approach that weighs the quality, impact, and importance of a candidate's scholarly contribution to their field of study. For example, we recognize that a smaller number of higher-quality publications may be of greater consequence than a larger number of lower-quality publications.

The department also values SAPA that involve students (e.g., as co-authors or co-presenters); that result from collaborations with other researchers, faculty, disciplines, and/or institutions; and that directly support the mission of the university (e.g., providing educational, training, and/or research opportunities for students).

To assist outside evaluators in understanding how SAPA is evaluated in our department, this document provides a list of example SAPA products. Specific evaluative guidelines are described for each type of SAPA listed.

Candidates and RTP committees should note that it is possible for a candidate to have multiple research “pipelines,” such as those based on student projects or interdisciplinary efforts. Candidates will be assessed on the overall quality of their SAPA and not on the basis of having a singular line of SAPA. For example, SAPA in multiple, but seemingly unrelated, areas may be just as valuable as the same number of SAPA in a single area, all things being equal. Given the interdisciplinary nature of much behavioral/social science research and the need to accommodate students’ diverse research interests, the variety of topics of SAPA *per se* should not be used as an indication of achievement.

For all criteria, “external” refers to organizations, individuals, and so forth, outside SJSU and the CSU; “internal” refers to organizations, individuals, and so forth, inside SJSU and the CSU.

## Categories and Examples of SAPA for Psychology and Their Evaluative Criteria

### Publications

#### Examples

- Journal articles
- Conference proceedings
- Books, textbooks
- Book chapters, encyclopedia entries
- Invited papers or presentations
- Monographs
- Treatment manuals
- Technical reports
- Book reviews
- Popular press articles (author, not subject of article)
- Letters to editor
- Invited blog posts that demonstrate scholarship
- Curricular materials for publishers (e.g., study guides, test banks, lecture slides, videos)
- Translations
- Brochures/pamphlets in conjunction with professional or governmental organizations

#### Evaluative criteria

**Publication types.** Manuscripts (published, in press, or accepted for publication) subjected to peer-review are considered superior to those that were not peer-reviewed. Publications in venues other than peer-reviewed professional journals or conference proceedings are given less weight than those subjected to peer-review and will be evaluated on an individual basis. For all publications, candidates should describe the type of review (if any) received and provide evaluative information. Such information could include metrics that indicate the quality of individual publications (e.g., a journal's impact factor, the competitiveness and/or prestige of the journal, an article's number of citations, circulation of a professional newsletter, recognition by an organization or agency) and the quality of the candidate's larger body of work (e.g., h-index, i10 index, overall number citations). Alternative metrics (e.g., number of downloads) may also be appropriate as indices of impact if justified by the candidate, particularly for SAPA products that are newly-published and/or do not appear in traditional academic journals (e.g., software programs created by the candidate).

Invited papers are weighted more than unsolicited papers in the sense that invited papers indicate that an invitation provides evidence of a candidate's stature in her/his field. Work

completed while a faculty member at SJSU is valued more highly than work conducted elsewhere (e.g., in graduate school, as a postdoc).

Articles that must survive a more competitive process (e.g., the journal rejects a high percentage of submissions), that appear in a prestigious journal (e.g., one with a high impact factor, or recognized as a leading journal in the candidate's field), or that are frequently cited (as noted in citation indices) are given more weight in the evaluation of faculty performance.

**Authorship.** In psychology, co-authored articles are common, so co-authored papers are not necessarily valued less than single-authored papers. In cases in which the candidate is one of several authors, first authorship is counted most heavily, except in areas in which the most senior author appears last. Candidates should note situations if they were the last author due to their senior or supervisory status on the article. Candidates can also indicate their status by stating if they were the corresponding author, with corresponding author status weighted more heavily. Regardless of the authorship order, the candidates should describe their contribution to each publication.

## **Presentations**

### **Examples**

- Paper presentations at conferences, workshops, training sessions/demonstrations, seminars, and so forth.
- Poster presentations

### **Evaluative criteria**

The criteria for evaluating presentations are the same as those for evaluating publications. The mode of presentation (oral vs. poster) may not always reflect the prestige of the presentation, so the mode *per se* should not be used as an evaluative criterion. Instead, candidates should indicate, where relevant, the prestige or scope of the conference (i.e., international, national, local). Candidates could also demonstrate achievement by noting the acceptance rate for presentations or other measures that indicate the prestige of the conference and accepted presentations (e.g., peer review, intended audience).

## **Grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements**

### **Examples**

- External grants, contracts, cooperative agreements (e.g., from government agencies, companies, research organizations, or charitable foundations).
- Internal grants (e.g., from the CSU Chancellor's Office, the SJSU Department of Psychology, SJSU College of Social Sciences, SJSU Provost's Office, SJSU Office of Research).

## **Evaluative criteria**

**Funding type.** Funded proposals are considered superior to non-funded proposals. External funding is considered superior to internal funding. The total amount of direct costs awarded will be considered. Overall, the scientific/scholarly merit of each project will also be considered, and candidates should describe the merits of their project.

**Candidate involvement.** The candidate's position on the proposal will be considered on a case-by-case basis, with lead positions (e.g., Principal Investigator, Project Director, Co-Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator) weighted more heavily than supportive positions (e.g., Methodologist, Consultant). Clinical, data-analysis, or other consultant activities conducted on grant-funded projects may be considered SAPA when they provide specific expertise integral to the research process (e.g., administering a specialized clinical assessment measure in a psychotherapy research trial, analyzing data from a grant).

Proposals that involve collaboration with non-SJSU faculty, disciplines, and/or institutions are highly valued.

## **Consulting and other professional activities**

### **Examples**

- Consulting with public sector organizations that involves the use of psychological theory, methods, and analytical procedures that results in some tangible product (e.g., technical report, policy paper, workplace or community intervention).
- Consulting with private sector organizations that involves the use of psychological theory, methods, and analytical procedures that results in some tangible product (e.g., technical report, policy paper, workplace or community intervention).

## **Evaluative criteria**

Consulting work may fit the definition of a synergistic practice or accomplishment. Candidates should clearly identify how this work contributes to SAPA as defined in S15-8 (i.e., 2.3.2. Scholarly achievements, 2.3.4, Professional achievements). Candidates will describe their role in consulting with public/private sector organizations, including the type of organization and the specific activities performed (e.g., polling, conducting focus groups, meeting with executives, analyzing public data, writing reports). Candidates should also provide information regarding the importance of their activities using criteria for previously described SAPA (e.g., impact, prestige, inclusion of students).

## **Patents, software, hardware, inventions, and so forth**

### **Examples**

- Patents
- Software
- Inventions
- Other unique intellectual property

### **Evaluative criteria**

Candidates will describe the product and their role in developing, bringing to market, and so forth, of the product. Candidates should also provide information regarding the importance of the product using criteria for previously described SAPA (e.g., impact, inclusion of students).

## **Awards for SAPA**

### **Examples**

- External (e.g., professional organizations, governmental agencies)
- Internal (e.g., SJSU, CSU)

### **Evaluative criteria**

Candidates should note any awards for excellence in SAPA (e.g., early career awards, best conference paper). External awards are weighted more heavily than are internal awards (conferred by any organizational unit within SJSU). Awards that are broader in scope (e.g., international) will be weighted more heavily than those that are more limited in scope (e.g., local). Candidates should provide information/evidence of the scope of the award and the prestige of the awarding body in their field and beyond.

## **III. Service**

Although a large department, expectations for service for psychology faculty do not differ from S15-8 policy on criteria and standards.

**Psychology Department Hypothetical Profile for Scholarly, Artistic, and Professional Achievements<sup>1</sup>**

S15-8 Criteria	Department Hypothetical Profile
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>  The candidate has not created scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level.	The candidate has not created scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level.
<b>Baseline</b>  The candidate has, over the course of the period of review, created a body of completed scholarly/artistic/professional achievements and shows the promise of continued growth and success within his/her discipline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate has published research in peer-reviewed journals.</li> <li>• Candidate has presented at professional conferences.</li> <li>• Candidate shows evidence of having developed a research “pipeline”. By “pipeline” we mean having research projects at different stages of completion (e.g., proposal, data collection, conference presentations, manuscript in progress, manuscript under review, manuscript published)</li> </ul>
<b>Good</b>  In addition to the baseline as described above, the candidate has created scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that constitute important contributions to the discipline and that help to enhance the scholarly/artistic/professional reputation of the candidate’s department, school, college, SJSU, or the CSU more generally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Either the candidate has publications as lead or senior author in peer-reviewed journals or has shown high scholarly productivity in peer-reviewed journals</li> <li>• There is evidence that the candidate’s research has had an impact on the discipline.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, candidate has accomplished at least <b>one</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate shows evidence of seeking internal or external funding.</li> <li>• Candidate has co-authored conference presentations with students.</li> <li>• Candidate has co-authored an article in peer-reviewed outlets with students.</li> <li>• Candidate has published research on the scholarship of teaching in peer-reviewed outlets.</li> <li>• Candidate has formed a productive research partnership with an external institution or group.</li> <li>• Candidate has produced non-peer reviewed articles or commentary meant to inform a wider audience about theory and research in his or her discipline.</li> </ul>
<b>Excellent</b>  In addition to a good performance as described above, this level requires achievements of both sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant, important, and growing reputation within the candidate’s field. Excellence in scholarly/artistic/professional achievement requires a body of work that is recognized as significant within the discipline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate has achievements of both sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant, important, and growing reputation within the candidate’s field</li> </ul> <p>In addition, candidate has accomplished <b>two</b> or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidate has received substantial external funding or contracts supporting research projects, or received positive reviews on her or his application(s) for grants.</li> <li>• Candidate has co-authored an article in peer-reviewed outlets with students.</li> <li>• Candidate has published research on the scholarship of teaching in peer-reviewed outlets.</li> <li>• Candidate has formed a productive research partnership with an external institution or group.</li> <li>• Candidate has produced non-peer reviewed articles or commentary meant to inform a wider audience about theory and research in his or her discipline.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup>This hypothetical profile is inclusive, not exclusive; the department recognizes that there are many ways to achieve significant SAPA accomplishments. The departmental RTP Committee takes a holistic approach weighing the quality, impact, and importance of a candidate's scholarly contribution to their field of study.