

Department of Psychology Bylaws

Approved: April 9, 2003

Amended: January 25, 2005

Amended: October 5, 2006

I. Department Faculty

All tenured and tenure-track faculty with an appointment of more than 50% in the Department of Psychology at Wright State University (WSU) and who are Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFMs) form an assembly referred to herein as the Department of Psychology faculty. The term “faculty meeting” is an official meeting of this assembly unless explicitly qualified otherwise.

II. Department Organization

A. Meetings

The Chair of the Department of Psychology (or “Department Chair”) is not a BUFM, but he/she normally presides as chair of faculty meetings in a non-voting capacity. Special faculty meetings without the presence of the Department Chair may be called so that an issue of importance to BUFMs may be discussed. These special faculty meetings will be called by the chair of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) at his or her discretion or upon receiving a petition from 1/3 or more of the faculty. The FDC chair will normally serve as chair pro tem of the special faculty meeting.

B. Agenda and Conduct of Meetings

Each faculty meeting should be announced at least one week in advance, and the announcement should be accompanied by all agenda items to be discussed and votes anticipated. Electronic-mail communications qualify as official announcements. Occasionally, a meeting may have to be called quickly to meet an exigency and the one calendar week notice may not be possible. When this is the case, all faculty members will be notified as quickly as possible. Faculty meetings and committee meetings are not normally scheduled during the summer period when faculty are not under contract. Exceptions are made only in unusual circumstances requiring rapid action, so that faculty can provide recommendations to the Department Chair. All Department faculty meetings and Department committee meetings will be conducted according to the current version of Robert’s Rules of Order.

Although only bargaining unit faculty members normally attend faculty meetings, the Department Chair typically presides at faculty meetings and participates in discussions; a secretary may be asked to take the minutes; and guests may be invited by the Department Chair. Further, faculty members who are not BUFMs (other than adjunct faculty hired on a course-by-course basis) can attend and

participate in faculty and committee meetings as non-voting members, as long as the meeting does not concern personnel matters and the majority of BUFMs do not object

C. **Quorum and Voting**

Unless otherwise specified (see IV.A.2 and VII.A), the quorum needed to conduct business at any meeting of the faculty is a simple majority of all faculty who are eligible to vote at a meeting, not including those faculty on official leave. When the number of faculty members needed for a quorum results in a fraction or a decimal, that number will be rounded to the next whole number. Only faculty members vote at meetings. Unless otherwise specified (see IV.A.2 and VII.A), or unless a faculty member requests a written ballot, voting is conducted by a show of hands, with a simple majority of votes in favor of a motion being required for a motion to pass.

III. **Department Committees**

The standing committees and their general charge are as follows:

- *Undergraduate Curriculum Committee*—issues related to the undergraduate curriculum and provision of recommendations on questions that arise regarding undergraduate education and standards.
- *Undergraduate Petitions Committee*—exceptions to policies regarding the undergraduate degree programs.
- *Undergraduate Scholarship Committee*—recommendation of undergraduate psychology student majors to be awarded scholarships.
- *Graduate Program Committee*—issues related to the graduate program and graduate curriculum and academic standards related to the graduate program. This committee has two standing subcommittees, the *Human Factors Area Subcommittee* and the *Industrial/Organizational Area Subcommittee*, which are responsible for issues specific to these individual areas of the graduate program.
- *Library Committee*—review of University library holdings and recommendations for acquisitions.
- *Human Subjects Committee*—coordination of the use of human subjects for research projects.
- *Space and Facilities Committee*—issues regarding the use of university space and facilities for research and teaching laboratories.
- *Faculty Development Committee (FDC)*—issues pertaining to recommendations regarding: promotion and tenure; professional development and mentoring of all faculty, especially new untenured faculty; the annual performance of Assistant and Associate Professors; the progress Assistant and Associate Professors are making toward promotion and/or tenure; peer evaluations of teaching; dismissals; professional development leave; issues of importance to individual faculty members, including but not limited to, teaching assignments, class schedules, summer teaching and overloads; special faculty appointments, such as visiting faculty; and issues affecting the Department or College.

Standing committees make recommendations as appropriate and report to the faculty. With the exception of the FDC, the Chairs of standing committees are appointed by the Department Chair. In addition to the standing committees, ad hoc committees may be constituted by the Department Chair or by the faculty. For ad hoc committees constituted by the Department Chair, the Chair of the committee is appointed by, and the committee makes recommendations to, the Department Chair. For ad hoc committees constituted by the faculty, the Chair of the committee is appointed by, and the committee makes recommendations to, the faculty. The FDC is comprised of all tenured BUFMs in the Department. The Department Chair may serve as an *ex*

officio non-voting member of the FDC with the approval of the FDC. The Chair of the FDC is chosen by and from the tenured BUFMs in the Fall quarter of each academic year. The Chair of the FDC normally holds the rank of Professor.

IV. Hiring Procedures

A. Regular Full-Time Faculty

All BUFM appointments of more than 50% in the Department of Psychology will adhere to the following procedure.

1. Priority and Constitution of Search Committee

Prior to the appointment of a Search Committee, faculty will recommend high priority areas and the relevant criteria for acceptable candidates. The position advertisement will be reviewed, and a recommendation to the Department Chair for approval of the advertisement will be made, in a timely fashion, at a faculty meeting. A Search Committee will be constituted so that a majority of its members are selected from and by Department of Psychology faculty. The Department Chair will appoint the remaining members as well as the Chair of the Search Committee. The Search Committee will review applicants' files and consult with faculty members. All applicant files will be available to faculty members.

2. Voting and Recommendations

The Search Committee will present and explain its tentative recommendations for whom to invite for a visit at a faculty meeting. After discussion with the faculty, and a vote by the faculty regarding their preference for which candidates to invite, the Search Committee will make its final vote as to which candidates to recommend to the Chair for a visit that includes a colloquium and meetings (alone or in groups) with faculty members.

After all candidates visit, a faculty meeting will be convened to vote on recommendations for hiring (a quorum of at least $\frac{3}{4}$ of all BUFMs is required). The Search Committee Chair will present and coordinate the discussion of candidates. Faculty will vote on candidates in two official votes, an acceptability vote and a preference vote. All votes will be taken by written ballots. Absentee voting is not permitted. Although unofficial "straw votes" may be repeated, an official vote cannot. Those candidates voted as acceptable by at least a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority of those faculty members present and voting yea or nay (and not abstain) will then be rank-ordered by the faculty. The faculty's hiring preference order represents the faculty's recommendation that the candidate with the highest ranking be offered the position first, and that the successively lower ranked candidates be offered the position only if the higher ranked candidate rejects an offer. The final rank ordering will be recommended to the Search Committee. The Search Committee then will forward its recommendations, together with the faculty's recommendations if they do not agree, to the Department Chair.

B. Department Chair

The faculty will participate in the selection of a Department Chair with the following procedures:

1. Search Committee

The search for a Department Chair will be conducted by a Search Committee appointed by the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics. A majority of the Search Committee members will be selected by and from the Department of Psychology faculty.

2. Voting and Recommendations

The procedures for voting and making recommendations by the faculty will be the same as those followed for hiring a regular faculty member as described above in Section IV.A. with the exception that the final recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean of the College. If there are both internal candidates and external candidates, they will be given equivalent treatment.

C. Appointments of Faculty Members who are not BUFMs

With the exceptions of adjuncts teaching on a course-by-course basis and positions recruited by individual faculty and funded by their grants, the FDC will make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding the hiring of nonBUFMs. Recommendations will be made regarding both the need for a particular position and the final selection of a candidate. These recommendations will be made at regularly scheduled faculty meetings.

V. Administrative Coordination, Efficiency, and Evaluation

A. Faculty Involvement in Governance

Faculty and the Department Chair are expected to work together collegially. If the Department Chair takes action (or elects not to act) following a recommendation from the faculty in the Department, then the Department Chair shall inform the faculty of the action (or inaction) and communicate the reasons for the decision in writing or at a faculty meeting.

B. Faculty Involvement in Review of the Department Chair

When the Department Chair is to be formally reviewed in accordance with the CBA, the faculty may meet and comment on guidelines concerning faculty involvement in the review. These will be presented as recommendations to the Dean, who oversees and administers the review. When the review is completed, each faculty member will receive a copy of the report. Faculty members may make recommendations to the Dean about the review process and their role in it at any time.

VI. Annual Evaluations of BUFMs

A. Procedures

A. Submission and Review of Materials

Early in Winter Quarter, each faculty member will prepare an annual activity report (Section VI.C.) covering the preceding calendar year. With regards to evidence of teaching effectiveness, tenured faculty members can choose whether to report numerical scores from student evaluations of teaching in their annual activity report as evidence of teaching effectiveness. A decision not to submit numerical scores from student evaluations will not have any negative consequences. Numerical scores from student course evaluations are to be used in reviewing untenured faculty. For both tenured and untenured faculty, narrative comments from student evaluations will be used as part of the evidence of teaching effectiveness.

The annual activity report should be submitted to the Department Chair and to the Chair of the FDC. Tenured Professors will submit their report only to the Department Chair. The FDC will use these reports to review all Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and untenured Professors regarding cumulative progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and to make recommendations to the Department Chair for his or her annual review of each faculty member. Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors can request in writing that evaluations regarding progress toward promotion to the next rank be conducted once every three years. Peer evaluations and other written materials from an identifiable source may be used by the FDC, but the faculty member being reviewed will be provided with a copy of these materials. The entire committee will participate in the discussion of untenured Assistant and Associate Professors. Only tenured Professors will participate in the discussion of tenured Associate Professors and untenured Professors.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The Department FDC will be responsible for peer evaluation of teaching of Assistant and Associate Professors. In addition to the narrative portion of student evaluations, peer evaluation can include review of course materials or other evidence to which the FDC has access. For untenured faculty, peer evaluation will also include at least one classroom visit per year by a tenured faculty member. The untenured faculty member may recommend to the FDC Chair which particular faculty member will visit. The FDC is responsible for selecting faculty members to conduct visits. The untenured faculty member normally will be notified of the visit at least a week in advance.

For tenured faculty, under normal conditions, classroom visits by a member or members of the FDC as part of peer evaluation of teaching will occur only at the request of the faculty member. The faculty member normally has the right to approve classroom visitors and the time of the visit. Under extreme circumstances, however, the FDC may initiate classroom visits if 2/3 of the FDC members present and voting agree that such visits are warranted. For Assistant and Associate Professors, visits must be made by a member or members of higher rank. Professors visit other Professors. Classroom visitation assignments are made by the FDC.

A letter describing observations made during the class visitation will be prepared by the visiting faculty member or members and will be reviewed as part of the annual evaluation by the Department Chair and as part of the FDC's formulation of recommendations to the Chair

and evaluation of cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. A copy of the report will also be given to the faculty member who was visited.

C. Annual Letters and Recommendation to the Chair

During Winter Quarter, the FDC will transmit letters to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and untenured Professors that evaluate annual activities and describe cumulative progress toward promotion to the next rank and/or tenure. Faculty whom the FDC judges will meet criteria for promotion will be notified in their annual evaluation letter that a formal consideration of initiating the promotion and tenure process by the FDC will occur in Spring Quarter. Copies of annual letters will be provided to the Department Chair to inform his or her annual evaluation of each faculty member's performance and will be placed in each faculty member's personnel file. The FDC will strive for unanimity on each letter, but if necessary, a letter will be agreed upon by simple majority vote. Individual faculty members may choose to challenge letters prepared by the FDC. To do so, the faculty member submits a rebuttal letter which is stapled to the FDC evaluation and placed on file, or requests a meeting with the FDC. Individual faculty members may also challenge letters of evaluation prepared by the Department Chair including the integers assigned for the annual evaluation. To do so, the faculty member sends a written response to the Chair. This rebuttal shall be stapled to the original evaluation and placed on file.

B. Evaluation Criteria

The Department Chair prepares evaluations for each faculty member that include the assignment of integers (0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = adequate, etc.) for annual evaluation in each of the three categories described below and the reasons for assigning these integers. The overall rating of the faculty member will be determined by the weighting of integers assigned in each area. The standard weighting will be 40% for teaching, 40% for scholarship, and 20% for service. The standard weighting will apply to all Psychology BUFMs unless the Department Chair assigns a different weighting after consulting with the faculty member. The faculty member and FDC should be informed of any such change.

Notes: (1) The examples given below to describe a particular level of performance are meant only to be that—examples. Not all studies in progress, manuscripts published, grants awarded, etc., are equivalent. The examples given below are intended to represent “average” items of each category. The quality of individual items, and therefore their impact on annual evaluations, must be judged on a case-by-case basis. (2) The adjectives below reflect performance in any one year. For decisions regarding promotion and tenure, it is necessary for the candidate to meet the criteria set forth in the Promotion and Tenure section of this document. The Promotion and Tenure criteria are based on achievements over a number of years and do not necessarily equate to the average of yearly ratings.

A. Teaching

1. 0 “unsatisfactory”: There is clear evidence of problematic teaching. Examples of problematic teaching might be failure to meet classes without notice on repeated occasions, being completely unprepared to conduct class on multiple occasions, and inappropriate behaviors with students in classes on multiple occasions.

2. 1 “adequate”: There is little or no evidence of problematic teaching, but there is also little indication of successful teaching. For example, there is little positive student reaction, generally neutral peer evaluations, negligible mentoring of students outside the classroom, and little course development. (Course development refers to continued improvement and updating of existing courses or development of new courses.)
3. 2 “meritorious”: There is evidence of successful teaching with little or no evidence of problematic teaching. Evidence of successful teaching might be provided by positive student evaluations, positive peer evaluations, some mentoring of students outside the classroom (e.g., supervision of independent study or independent research by students, advising an undergraduate honors thesis, or serving on a graduate degree committee), and examples of course development.
4. 3 “outstanding”: There is evidence that the faculty member provides an excellent learning experience with a clear and positive influence on students. Evidence might be provided by enthusiastic student evaluations, extremely positive peer evaluations, examples of extensive course development in the annual evaluation materials, and several instances of successful mentoring of students.
5. 4 “extraordinary”: There is evidence that the faculty member’s performance exceeds the criteria for “outstanding” in some regard and has made a unique contribution to student learning. For example, the faculty member has provided exemplary learning experiences in the classroom, has been especially innovative in course development, or has been especially successful in mentoring many students as evidenced by student evaluations or peer evaluations.

B. Scholarship

1. 0 “unsatisfactory”: The faculty member shows negligible research activity (e.g., no studies in progress or manuscripts or grant applications submitted) and negligible productivity (e.g., no papers presented, manuscripts accepted for publication, or grant proposals funded) during the past year.
2. 1 “adequate”: The faculty member shows at least a modest level of research activity but no productivity, or a modest level of research productivity but no activity. Examples of a modest level of activity would be two of the following: a study underway, a manuscript submitted for publication, a paper submitted for presentation at a conference, or a grant proposal submitted for funding; examples of a modest level of productivity would be one of the following: a manuscript or book chapter accepted for publication, a rigorously reviewed extramural grant proposal funded, or some combination of two or more proceedings papers accepted or conference presentations given.
3. 2 “meritorious”: The faculty member shows at least a modest level of both activity and productivity (examples given above under VI.B.2.b).
4. 3 “outstanding”: The faculty member shows a high level of either activity (e.g., studies underway and either multiple manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed journals, or one to two papers submitted to peer-reviewed journals together with submission of an external grant application) or productivity (e.g., multiple papers accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals, or one to two papers accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals together with an external grant award and papers presented at a regional or national conference) and at least a modest level of

the other (examples of modest levels of activity and productivity given above under VI.B.2.b).

5. 4 “extraordinary”: The faculty member shows high levels of both activity and productivity (examples given above under VI.B.2.d).

C. Service

Notes: (1) Attendance at Departmental faculty meetings and participation in the FDC (for those BUFMs who are members) are expected duties. Performance of these duties will not enhance the rating given for service, but continued neglect of these duties will detract from the service rating. (An exception is made for the Chair of the FDC—this position is regarded as service.) (2) Because service is viewed as primarily the responsibility of Associate Professors and Professors, the criteria below applies to them. Except in cases of repeated unexcused absences from Departmental faculty meetings, the rating of 0 is not given to Assistant Professors. Those Assistant Professors meeting the definition of 0 will be given a rating of 1; those meeting the definition of 1 will be given a rating of 2, etc. Service need not be restricted to that performed at or for Wright State University, so long as it is clear that such service activity contributes to the goals of the Department, College, University, or profession. Examples of professional activity include serving as an officer in a professional society, organizing a professional meeting, serving as an editor of a professional journal, serving as a member of an editorial board, serving on an external grant review panel, and ad hoc reviewing of grant proposals or manuscripts. Consulting and/or other similar professional activities may be considered as service, but only insofar as they enhance the University’s reputation and/or significantly contribute to the professional stature of the faculty member.

1. 0 “unsatisfactory”: The faculty member performs negligible service for any of the relevant groups (i.e., the Department, College, University, or profession).
2. 1 “adequate”: The faculty member participates in service at a minimal level (e.g., the equivalent of participating in one or two committees requiring a low level of effort with quarterly or less frequent meetings) for any relevant group.
3. 2 “meritorious”: The faculty member exhibits a significant level of performance for any relevant group (e.g., serving on multiple committees, one of which requires a high level of time and effort, or of one of which the faculty member is chair).
4. 3 “outstanding”: The faculty member performs a large amount of service to relevant groups, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Department, College, or University, as indicated by, e.g., chairing two or more committees and serving on another committee with a high level of effort.
5. 4 “extraordinary”: The faculty member exceeds the criteria for a rating of 3 by additional service to relevant groups, or by an amount of service indicated in 3 together with a clear demonstration of exemplary service (e.g., an award from the committee or group in question noting an exceptional contribution or a remarkable achievement by the committee for which the faculty member was instrumental).

C. Annual Activity Report Outline

The following is the outline format to be used by BUFMs in preparing their annual activity report.

A. Scholarly Productivity

1. Articles, books, or book chapters published
 2. Articles, books, or book chapters in press (indicate the date any manuscript was accepted for publication by the editor)
 3. Papers or posters presented at professional meetings
 4. Papers or posters accepted for presentation at professional meetings
 5. Other evidence of scholarly productivity
- B. Scholarly Activity
1. Articles, book proposals, or book chapters submitted (indicate where and when submission was made)
 2. Papers or posters submitted for presentation at professional meetings
 3. Manuscripts in preparation (indicate tentative title and place of submission)
 4. Investigations underway [indicate stage of investigation (e.g., data collection in progress)]
 5. Other evidence of scholarly activity
- C. Grants and contracts (Provide amount and duration of each)
1. Grants and contracts funded
 2. Grants and contracts submitted
- D. Service (Especially heavy service activities may be described)
1. Department
 2. College of Science and Mathematics
 3. Other program or unit (e.g., Biomedical Sciences, School of Professional Psychology)
 4. University
 5. Reviewing for journals or funding agencies
 6. Private practice, consulting, or similar professional activities with or without remuneration that enhance reputation of the University or significantly contribute to faculty member's professional stature
 7. Other evidence of service, including any documentation of unusual achievements.
- E. Teaching
1. Courses taught Winter, Spring, Summer, Fall (for each course, submit evidence of teaching effectiveness or, if tenured, indicate that narrative comments from the student evaluations are to be used as such evidence). Untenured Assistant Professors must submit all peer evaluations of their teaching.
 2. Special teaching methods or innovations
 3. Other evidence of teaching performance
- F. Post-doctoral courses or workshops taken, or other continuing education experiences
- G. Membership in professional societies
- H. Any other information relevant to your performance

Note: Additional information may also be requested by the Department Chair or the Chair of the FDC.

VII. Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

A. Procedures

In Spring quarter, the FDC will consider recommending that faculty initiate promotion and tenure procedures. Faculty members can also initiate the promotion and tenure process without the recommendation of the FDC. In either case, the process regarding promotion and tenure is formally initiated when a candidate for promotion and/or tenure requests in writing to the Department Chair (with copies to the Faculty Development Committee) that she or he wishes to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. This request must be made by May 1. Such requests from Assistant Professors will be evaluated by all tenured members of the FDC. Such requests from Associate Professors and untenured Professors will be evaluated by all tenured members of the FDC who hold the rank of Professor. In either case, a quorum is constituted by at least 3/4 of all eligible BUFMs. Voting will take place with written ballots and will continue, with interspersed discussion, until two consecutive votes yield identical results. Motions will pass when a majority of votes in favor of the motion are cast.

Candidates must also submit in writing to the chair of the FDC by May 1 the names of six individuals who could evaluate the candidate's scholarship, as well as a brief description of the candidate's relationship with each possible reviewer. Nominated reviewers should not have had a close personal relationship with the candidate, such as an advisor, supervisor, student, or collaborator. The final list of reviewers will be approved by both the FDC and the candidate. The FDC will select one of its members to assist the candidate in preparing a promotion and tenure document. Candidates must submit materials to be sent to outside reviewers by the date specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Within about 2 weeks of the approval of the final list of outside reviewers, the mentor will meet with the candidate to determine the date by which materials will be sent to the outside reviewers. This date must be no later than the date specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

B. Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate

Professor with Tenure

1. Teaching

Over the probationary period, candidates must demonstrate effective teaching in the classroom and outside of the classroom. Effective teaching in the classroom includes, but is not limited to, all of the following: being available for consultation, defining students' responsibilities for courses, using class time efficiently, and stimulating interest in course material. Effective teaching outside of the classroom includes, but is not limited to, some combination of the following activities: supervising research assistants; supervising students doing independent readings, independent research, practica, or honor's theses; authoring publications with students; and participating on graduate student committees.

Methods of evaluation include observations of classroom performance and review of course syllabi, innovative teaching techniques, multimedia presentations, and laboratory development; student evaluations (numerical scores and comments from the University Student Evaluation of Instruction form); observations made, and information obtained, by members of the FDC or the Department Chair when applicable and shared with the candidate; and review of any additional information submitted by the candidate.

2. **Extramural Funding**

The Department of Psychology has a history of strong extramural funding, with extramural funding expected of all faculty members. However, it is recognized that opportunities for obtaining and appropriate forms of funding vary across sub-disciplines of psychology. Therefore, faculty may satisfy the funding requirement with different levels and types of funding awarded during the probationary period. A candidate who obtains a lower level of funding will need to balance this performance with a higher level of scholarship as described below (VII.A.3).

Extramural funding in psychology can come from diverse sources and need not be in a form traditional to other sciences. Extramural funding includes monetary awards from governmental funding agencies, businesses, foundations, or trusts whether the funds are provided to support research or an important academic mission of the department. Contributions “in kind,” such as equipment, software, products, services, supplies, or materials are thus considered extramural funding. Graduate student support in the form of externally supported research assistantships, internships, or paid consulting by a BUFM’s student will be credited to the faculty member as extramural funding. Salary from grants, summer faculty fellowships, or funded research also count towards extramural funding requirements.

Support for research includes situations in which money is not exchanged, provided the candidate can document such arrangements support research activities.

Extramural funding obtained in collaboration with faculty members within the Department of Psychology, other departments or colleges, or other Universities will be counted towards extramural funding requirements, provided that the candidate is either (1) principal investigator, or (2) co-principal investigator (or equivalent) who has played a major role in obtaining the funding and is a central figure in the implementation of any research that the funding supports.

3. **Scholarship**

Associate Professor is the rank assigned to those who have demonstrated intellectual excellence in their research and an independent and coherent substantive research program. Candidates’ research records should be of a quality and quantity to place them on track for achieving national prominence in their area of expertise. Over the probationary period, candidates must show that they can conduct research independent of their mentors from graduate school or a postdoctoral appointment. They must have a record of publications based on work done at WSU that is sufficient in quality and quantity to make a substantial and sustained contribution to knowledge in their area of expertise. These requirements are met by:

- Publishing at least 8 peer-reviewed articles or book chapters (including papers accepted for publication) and receiving at least \$25,000 in extramural funding (total direct and indirect costs), in one of the combinations specified in the table below. The amount of extramural funding may be met by types of funding specified in

Article VII.A.2 of these bylaws. Peer-reviewed articles must be high quality articles as evidenced by publication in journals that are well respected in the candidate’s area of expertise.

Peer-reviewed journal articles from research at WSU, with the faculty member as first or sole author	Extramural funding	Other peer-reviewed publications or book chapters
4	\$75,000	4
5	\$50,000	3
6	\$25,000	2

Peer-reviewed publications in the first column of this table must be based on research generated in the candidate’s independent research program subsequent to tenure-track appointment at WSU, have WSU listed as the candidate’s affiliation, and have the faculty member as first (or sole) author, except one publication may be in one of the three categories noted below. If a student for whom the candidate is advisor or supervisor is first author and the candidate is a subsequent author, the paper will count as though the candidate was first author.

One of the papers required in the first column of the table may be either: (1) a peer-reviewed theoretical paper that makes a clear and original contribution to the literature beyond the compiling of earlier findings; (2) a peer-reviewed article generated from the candidate’s independent research program at WSU in collaboration with a colleague on which the colleague is first author, if the candidate played an important role in the research including its inception and/or design, as documented by the article’s first author; or (3) a paper based on the work of the candidate’s independent research program prior to tenure track appointment at WSU. In order for the last option to hold, the candidate would need to document the existence of an independent research program with, for instance, a record of independent funding for the research or a title such as Assistant Professor, Assistant Research Professor, or Research Psychologist that indicates independence from a mentor during the period that the research was conducted.

- Three or more letters by outside reviewers who evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarship.
- Making the presentation of at least 3 papers at national or international meetings based on work done subsequent to tenure-track appointment at WSU.

Methods of evaluation include review of annual evaluations, publication and funding record, letters from outside reviewers, and any additional information submitted by the candidate.

4. Service

Over the probationary period, the candidate is expected to make only modest contributions to service activities in the Department, College, University, or profession. These contributions typically involve serving on committees and reviewing articles for journals.

C. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Professor is the rank assigned to those who have been recognized by their peers nationally for outstanding scholarship. The achievements of a candidate's students are often evidence of personal scholarship. The candidate's record is evaluated for teaching, scholarship, and service. Exceeding the standards for teaching and service cannot compensate for failure to meet the criteria required in scholarship.

1. Teaching

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires evidence of sustained and effective teaching as defined for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate should also contribute leadership to either the undergraduate or graduate curriculum by developing courses and programs, offering critical courses, and supervising students in honors thesis, master's thesis, and/or doctoral dissertation research. Joint publications, for which the candidate provided student supervision, are evidence of effective teaching.

Methods of evaluation include observations of classroom performance and review of course syllabi; review of innovative teaching techniques and laboratory development; review of student evaluations (as appropriate for rank); information obtained by members of the FDC or the Department Chair when applicable and shared with the candidate; and review of information submitted by the candidate.

2. Extramural Funding

The candidate must have a record of funding sufficient to sustain a productive independent research program in his or her area, and to achieve one of the combinations of extramural funding and scholarship described below (VII.B.3).

3. Scholarship

Promotion depends on evidence of national stature in the profession and on the quantity of professional publications and presentations. These requirements are met by:

- Extramural funding and a strong record of publications. The candidate must have a research record showing substantial and sustained contribution to the field. This may include data based research, theoretical articles, or review articles. Requirements will ordinarily include a total of twenty-five articles or book chapters (including papers accepted for publication), with at least 20 peer-reviewed articles and at least \$50,000 in extramural funding (from sources defined in VII.A.2), in one of the combinations specified in the table below.

Book chapters and peer-reviewed articles at WSU, with WSU listed as the affiliation, beyond the requirement for Associate Prof.	Extramural Funding beyond the requirement for Associate Prof	Other publications
11	\$100,000	14
13	\$75,000	12
15	\$50,000	10

- The first two columns of this table indicate the number of publications and amount of funding required which is beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor. Peer-reviewed articles must be high quality articles as evidenced by publication in journals that are well respected in the candidate's area of expertise. At least 15 of the 25 articles or book chapters must have been published since the candidate arrived at WSU, with WSU listed as the affiliation. Of the 25 publications in the first and third columns, at least 13 must be data-based research in which the candidate is first author, and at least 20 must be peer-reviewed journal articles. If a student for whom the candidate is advisor or supervisor is the first author, the publication will be credited to the candidate as if he or she was first author, regardless of author order.
- Three or more letters from outside reviewers attesting to the candidate's national status as a scholar.
- Making the presentation of at least twenty papers at either national or international professional meetings, at least 10 of which have been made since coming to WSU.
- Exhibiting two or more additional indicators of national stature. Examples of such indicators are: membership on the Editorial Board of a journal, reviewing for several journals or national granting organizations, serving as an officer in a national professional organization, membership of a review panel for a granting agency, election to the status of Fellow in a professional organization, serving as an expert witness, being called on as a consultant at the national level, being asked to edit a special volume of a journal, giving a key note address, or being asked to be a discussant on a symposium at a national meeting.

Methods of evaluation include review of annual evaluations, publication and funding record, letters from outside reviewers, and any additional information submitted by the candidate.

4. Service

The candidate is expected to have shown substantial and sustained service and leadership in the Department, the College, the University, and/or the profession. Normally a candidate will have made significant contributions at all of these levels, though it is acceptable for candidates to make particularly strong contributions at some levels and more modest contributions at others. In any event, the overall pattern should be one of strong service and leadership. Beyond normal participation (e.g., regular attendance at departmental meetings),

Departmental service includes committee leadership and conscientious advising of undergraduate and/or graduate students. The candidate should have served on College or University committees. Professional service at the national or international level includes such activities as serving as an officer for professional organizations, participating in a governmental panel, serving on committees for professional organizations, or serving as reviewer for journals or funding agencies.

D. Tenure Requirements for Untenured Associate Professors and Professors

Individuals hired as untenured Associate Professors and untenured Professors have maximum three-year and two-year probationary periods, respectively.

1. Requirements for Untenured Associate Professors for Tenure

Untenured Associate Professors must fulfill all requirements pertaining to teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure (as described in Sections VII.A.1-4) with the following exceptions regarding work completed at WSU. For scholarship, at least one of the candidate's refereed journal publications must be based on work completed subsequent to tenure-track appointment at WSU, have WSU listed as the candidate's affiliation, and have the faculty member as first (or sole) author. If a WSU student for whom the candidate is primary advisor is first author and the candidate is a subsequent author, the paper will count as though the candidate was first author. Service at WSU should not only meet, but exceed, the modest contributions expected of Assistant Professors. This may be demonstrated by, for instance, participating in multiple committees and serving as Chair of at least one. There should be evidence of effective teaching at WSU.

2. Requirements for Untenured Professors for Tenure

Untenured Professors must fulfill all requirements pertaining to teaching, scholarship, and service for promotion to Professor with tenure (as described in Sections VII.B.1-4) with following exceptions regarding work completed at WSU. For scholarship, at least one of the candidate's refereed journal articles must be based on work completed subsequent to tenure-track appointment at WSU, have WSU listed as the candidate's affiliation, and have the faculty member as first (or sole) author. If a WSU student for whom the candidate is primary advisor is first author and the candidate is a subsequent author, the paper will count as though the candidate was first author. For service, the candidate's entire academic career will be evaluated with an emphasis on continuation of a strong service record at WSU. There should be evidence of effective teaching at WSU, and evidence of leadership in teaching activities (as defined in VII.B.1) either before or since being hired at WSU.

VIII. Summer Policies regarding Teaching Assignments

The following principles will be used to guide summer teaching assignments:

- Faculty on nine-month contracts cannot be required to teach during the summer terms.
- BUFMs have precedence over nontenure-track or adjunct faculty.

- Among those BUFMs who have been at WSU for at least five years, those who have taught fewer summer courses in the last five years will have higher priority for summer teaching or for a second course of summer teaching than those who have taught more summer courses over this same span.
- Faculty who are within three years of retirement and who provide to the chair a written statement of their intent to retire are given the highest preference for summer teaching and for teaching two courses during summer term. If retirement is delayed, this preference is not given beyond the initial three years.

IX. Amendments

Amendments may be proposed by any faculty member. A verbatim copy of proposed changes must be provided to faculty at least two calendar weeks before the meeting at which the proposed amendments are to be discussed. This meeting will be run by the chair of the Faculty Development Committee. A majority of the bargaining unit faculty (whether present or not and whether on leave or not) must vote in favor of the amendment to forward the proposed amendment to the Dean and Faculty Governance Committee. A faculty member must be present at the meeting in order to cast a vote. If the vote is positive, the proposed amendment may then be submitted to the Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics and to the Faculty Governance Committee for approval.