Academic Professionals must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Manual for Review of Academic Professionals and Promotion of Academic Professionals to Senior Academic Professionals. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college policy takes precedence.
INTRODUCTION

This document describes the process for the review of Academic Professionals and for the promotion of Academic Professionals to Senior Academic Professional in the Department of Psychology. All Academic Professionals are reviewed annually for contract renewal, as these positions are not tenure track and are not intended to become so. Academic Professionals who are re-appointed after five years of consecutive service will be promoted to Senior Academic Professional, to begin in their seventh year of service. Academic Professionals not re-appointed after five years will be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

There are two types of reviews specific for Academic Professionals; these are the third-year review and fifth-year review of Academic Professionals, with promotion to Senior Academic Professional. The third-year review is to provide a cumulative analysis of the quality and extent of service and instructional contributions.

In these reviews, the primary consideration is contributions in service. Contributions in instruction will also be considered as part of the reviews if a candidate’s workload includes teaching. Other activities, such as publications of research and scholarship, are not required but may be considered dependent upon assigned workload.

Service includes advising and serving the academic needs of students, and is typically performed at the departmental and college levels, but may include university service. Professional service, as well as public service involving professional expertise, is also relevant. Instruction includes teaching students, both inside and outside the classroom environment.

The timing of the review for promotion, as well as the details of the
documentation, will follow that outlines in the University and College of Arts and Sciences policies. The Department of Psychology will nominate for promotion to Senior Academic Professional only those candidates who present evidence of a sustained record of excellence in service and excellence in teaching.

This document does not cover the annual review and annual contract renewal review that occur for all tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. The process for these annual evaluations will follow the established departmental policies as specified in other documents. Since annual reviews are distinct from the third-year and fifth-year reviews in that they involve different evaluating bodies, different materials, and different time spans, one may not be able to make a reliable inference from the annual reviews to the results of the fifth-year review.

**SERVICE**

Service comprises at least 50% of the Academic Professional’s job functions. The quality of service of Academic Professionals is of paramount importance; indeed, it is the heart of what Academic Professionals do. Accordingly, a candidate must be rated as excellent in service to receive promotion to Senior Academic Professional. Expectations regarding types of service activities will be detailed at the time of appointment in writing and may be modified at the annual evaluation. The service of Academic Professionals is judged with respect to degree of diligence and level of effectiveness. Specifically, candidates will be judged excellent if they have (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been highly effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed substantial service roles that serve the mission of the university,
within the scope of their appointment. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

**TEACHING**

**Categories of Teaching**

If their workload includes teaching, candidates for promotion to Senior Academic Professional should submit written evidence of effective classroom teaching as mandated by the college manual. Additionally, when individual student instruction is included in the candidate’s workload, the following information should be provided: supervision of directed readings or independent study courses; direction of honors theses; membership on student committees; advisement of students; and evidence of students’ successful endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship (e.g., presentations and publications).

**Evaluation of Teaching**

As stated in the college manual, promotion is available only to those who are judged to be excellent in teaching. A candidate will be judged excellent in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at teaching, which is typically demonstrated by effectiveness in classroom-related instruction and is engaged in effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective candidates will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into
account such factors as the type of course. Depending on workload assignment, the candidate may be expected to demonstrate a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis committee(s), supervision of directed readings, research or independent study courses, direction of honors theses, and advisement of students. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship.
ASSESSMENT RUBRIC FOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL RANKS

SERVICE

Candidates will be judged **outstanding** if the criteria for excellent are met and they have been substantially engaged in professional organizations or won a prestigious service award.

Candidates will be judged **excellent** if they have (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been highly effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) effectively assumed substantial service roles that serve the mission of the university, within the scope of their appointment. In addition, candidates may have made significant contributions to professional associations or to other organizations (e.g., non-profits, businesses) that benefit from the candidate’s expertise.

Candidates will be judged **very good** if they have (a) been active in assistance to colleagues, (b) been effective in the service tasks assigned to them, and (c) assumed service roles that serve the mission of the department or university, within the scope of their appointment.

Candidates will be judged **good** in service if they have been active in assistance to colleagues and carried out the service tasks assigned to them, within the scope of their appointment.

The evaluation of **fair** and **poor** are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.

TEACHING

A candidate will be judged **outstanding** in teaching if the record of highly effective instruction and student mentoring exceeds the criteria for excellent. For instance, the student evaluation scores and comments suggest inspirational performance in the classroom, the course materials presented shows exceptional preparation, and the candidate demonstrates a high level of effective mentoring of students. The candidate may have also published a textbook or peer reviewed article on the science of pedagogy, or received one or more teaching awards.
A candidate will be judged excellent in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is highly effective at teaching, which is typically demonstrated by effectiveness in classroom-related instruction and is engaged in effective mentoring of students outside of the classroom. Highly effective candidates will demonstrate diligent and thoughtful course development, preparation, and/or execution. One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Depending on workload assignment, the candidate may be expected to demonstrate a commitment to mentoring students outside of the classroom. Involvement in mentoring may include, for example, involvement on thesis committee(s), supervision of directed readings, research or independent study courses, direction of honors theses, and advisement of students. Other mentoring activities relevant to the candidate’s assigned workload and described in the dossier will also be evaluated. Effectiveness of mentoring is gauged by evidence of students’ endeavors connected with the candidate’s mentorship.

A candidate will be judged very good in teaching if the evidence indicates that the candidate is effective in teaching, typically demonstrated by effective classroom instruction – based on the markers of effectiveness described above – and moderate involvement in mentoring students, if mentoring is expected in a candidate’s assigned workload.

A candidate will be judged good in teaching if the candidate does not meet criteria for a rating of very good, but at least demonstrates competence in teaching, based on the markers of effectiveness described above.

The evaluation of fair and poor are reserved for candidates who fall short of meeting the standards listed above for good performance.