

Psychology Department
Revised August 2015

The College has encouraged departments to outline expectations for tenure & promotion for probationary colleagues so that they are aware of what standards are expected as they progress in their time on campus. In this document we have specified the minimal acceptable standards for each area, although we would expect that successful candidates will perform above the minimum in at least one of the three areas.

We would encourage you to engage in regular dialogue with the tenured members of the department as to your progress/performance in these areas.

Scholarship Expectations for Tenure

By the end of the 2nd year toward tenure:

All faculty: By this time a new faculty member is expected to have established a program of research (e.g., setting up lab space, conducting initial studies, seeking research funding) that has involved at least two students per year.

In addition, all faculty members will be expected to have made at least one presentation (with or without student co-authors) at a regional or national conference.

Additionally, for faculty members receiving course credit for supervising student research (PSYC382): We would expect that these activities will have led to the sponsorship of a minimum of two student presentations at undergraduate conferences (e.g., Illowa, Tri-State, Celebration of Learning). We expect that each will be substantially different in nature, per APA guidelines. (For example, an ILLOWA presentation and a Celebration of Learning presentation on the same analysis or the same dataset would not count as two presentations.)

By the end of the 4th year toward tenure:

All faculty: By this point the faculty member will have an active research program established. All faculty will be expected to have made at least one presentation (with or without students as co-authors) at a regional or national conference since their last pre-tenure review.

For faculty receiving course credit for PSYC382: Although the numbers of students participating will undoubtedly vary, the expectation would be that at least 15 student credit hours (or the non-credit equivalent) would be involved across the year. We would expect that these activities would have resulted in at least 6 undergraduate conference presentations (e.g., Illowa, Tri-State, Celebration of Learning) since the first pretenure review.

By the Tenure review:

All faculty: By this point the candidate should have produced a total of 3 conference presentations at regional or national forums and one peer-reviewed publication. Given the protracted nature of the peer-review process and the possibility of null findings, faculty who have not published at the time of the tenure review must show evidence of programmatic research productivity. That is, the faculty member should be able to document a sustained logical attempt to address an issue. This documentation will include details of changes the faculty member has made between studies in an attempt to refine hypotheses and/or methodology.

For faculty receiving course credit for PSYC382: Our expectations for student involvement and productivity would remain the same. Specifically, we would expect the successful candidate to generate at least 15 credit hours of student participation (or its equivalent) and 2 student presentations per year.

Departmental expectations for service

We expect that candidates for tenure will be involved in the life of the Department, as well as the larger College community. In addition, many candidates will want to become an active participant in the surrounding communities (e.g., Rock Island, the Quad Cities). While active participation is required at the department and college levels, a candidate's participation in service activities should always be viewed as secondary to their teaching. In other words, if a candidate is struggling in the classroom we would hope that they would devote 100% of their energy and time toward improving that. Our *minimal* expectations for a person to get the departmental recommendation for tenure are that the person be an excellent department colleague and involved across campus in increasingly meaningful ways. Below we try to flesh out the trajectory that would most likely take.

In the **first year** on campus, the primary goal should be to become an integral, integrated member of the department. Throughout the year, the candidate should work to develop relationships with department members, getting to know them, their research interests, activities on campus, etc., as well as allowing the department to learn more about the candidate. It is expected that all faculty attend department meetings and participate in the discussions when he/she has things to contribute. Candidates should be mindful of a need to develop a niche within the department, discovering what they can uniquely contribute to on-going needs (e.g., managing the department website, advising Psychology Club).

Within the **second year**, we expect new faculty to be noticeably involved on campus. This might take the form of participation in Friday Conversations, First Year Advising, or teaching in AGES. Candidates should serve on at least one campus committee. Committee work and campus-wide meetings are the primary means by which candidates will become known by faculty outside the department. By the end of the second year, we would expect that a new colleague would be known by several faculty in

departments across campus. Although we aren't grading on "playing well with others," we see contact with faculty in other departments as reflecting a necessary desire to participate in the life of the college. In addition, in this second year, advisees would be assigned to the faculty member which will substantially increase the service they provide to the department. This will require mastery of the department curriculum, as well as the general education requirements of the college.

Throughout the subsequent probationary years we would expect a person to continue to grow in their participation across campus. As they progress toward tenure, we would hope that they would play a central role in some area (e.g., within CFE, AGES, or Celebration of Learning). The overriding theme to this participation is that candidates need to demonstrate that they are interested in and actively engaged in both the department and larger campus community. Our new colleagues should bear in mind that while the department makes the first influential vote regarding tenure, individuals largely if not entirely outside the department (i.e., the Faculty Welfare Committee) will ultimately render a recommendation on behalf of the faculty. It is crucial that over the course of the probationary period our new colleagues build relationships with and become known to faculty in many departments across campus. Working in relative isolation within the department, no matter how effectively, will likely prove to be an obstacle to tenure.

With respect to service to the broader community, we have no specific expectations since the forms that that could take would vary so widely.

Departmental expectations for teaching and advising

Throughout the probationary period, we expect to see improvement in a candidate's teaching although the pattern and rate of that improvement will undoubtedly vary from person to person. Although IDEA data is definitely an important source of information, we see it as only one piece of information. Additionally, we will consider the following in evaluating quality of teaching:

- **Classroom observations:** Throughout the probationary period the department chair will observe classes. He/she will be trying to determine the overall atmosphere of the class (e.g., are students paying attention? Participating? Is there a positive dynamic in the class?) as well as assessing the depth of the material being presented and the clarity with which it is presented. Prior to the tenure hearing, all tenured members of the department will sit in on classes.
- **Student interviews:** Before each review the department chair will interview students who have taken courses from the candidate. Interviewees would be asked to evaluate the instructor's quality of teaching and to suggest areas of improvement. We have found that students can change their evaluations of an instructor or class after a period of time. (For example, an "easy" class may get high marks on the IDEA scores but students may rate that class poorly when they find out that they weren't prepared for subsequent courses. Conversely, a course

that isn't rated very positively on the IDEA scores may be seen as much more valuable with time.) Through the interviews we hope to see the longer-term impact of instruction.

- The quality of the syllabi prepared for a class. This is not meant to imply that lengthy, detailed syllabi are necessary, but that the instructor has carefully and thoughtfully set the expectations for the course and clearly explained them to students.
- Given the "skills by levels" expectations we have adopted as a department, we would expect that classes would be developed in line with those expectations. Any major deviations from those expectations should be discussed with the department members since it impacts our shared mission.
- Reactions to negative feedback: We would expect that there will be occasions when courses don't go as well as the instructor would hope. We are less concerned with the fact that such things happen than in how the person responds to his/her "failures." Making a course easier or catering to students' demands is not desirable. However, we would expect that the instructor would give thoughtful consideration to student complaints and would use good pedagogical rationale for any changes that are made.

Advising: Active participation and strong engagement in academic advising is expected for tenure. To prepare for the assessment of advising, candidates should provide a brief description of the advising goals and practices that define his/her advising philosophy. In describing philosophy of advising, candidates could describe the nature of his/her goals and activities in advising within the major/and or first year advising more broadly and the strategies used to provide support to students outside the classroom, including how the candidate helps students plan and complete their degree programs, and prepares students for post-graduate success. Candidates should also include the approximate number of students s/he has advised. Submit any materials that provide evidence about the overall quality of advising. If applicable, the candidate could also discuss his/her approach to mentoring students.