

### **Preamble**

The Department of Behavior Analysis adheres to the personnel policies for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review found in relevant sections of the UNT Policy Manual and other policies related to the evaluation of tenure-track and tenured faculty (06.004) as well as full-time, non-tenure track faculty (06.005). The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement the UNT guidelines.

This document describes the standards and criteria by which the Department of Behavior Analysis will evaluate its faculty for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. The document describes these standards in the context of three broad areas in which faculty may directly contribute: teaching, scholarship, and service. Each section is complimented by a corresponding rubric that details further the criteria established for process and outcome measures of both quantity and quality indicators. Quality indicators have been further subdivided into categories of developing, proficient, and expert. The document further outlines the responsibilities of candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure as well as those sustaining their current rank, the Department Chair, and the Departmental review committee. The examples and rubrics provided in this document can serve as a guide for tenure-track; tenured; and full-time, non-tenure-track faculty to prepare materials for tenure and/or promotion. In the case of post-tenure review, the document provides criteria by which faculty can ensure continued productivity and contribution to the mission of the Department of Behavior Analysis. The Department of Behavior Analysis evaluates faculty members' performance in an integrated and holistic manner by which truly exemplary performance in one category can compensate for performance in other categories.

### **Teaching**

The Department of Behavior Analysis expects excellence in teaching and seeks to promote a culture of continuous improvement in pedagogic practices. The Department also recognizes that effective pedagogy is not necessarily contained solely within the classroom or in formalized and structured seminars. As such, the Department also recognizes and encourages sustained supervision and mentoring of students as an important part of the faculty member's teaching repertoire and responsibilities. Faculty members in the Department of Behavior Analysis engage in teaching when they design and teach structured courses and seminars; coordinate and lead research and teaching labs; and mentor students across several different research- and practice-based activities such as advising students on thesis and dissertation research, supervising students in practice and internships, etc.

Teaching activities can be assessed along three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. The teaching activities that correspond to each dimension, followed by the types of evidence that can be gathered to support the assessment of the quality and quantity of teaching excellence are as follows.

### **Content**

The content dimension of teaching excellence refers to the structural features of the course as well as the relevance, timeliness, and organization of course materials. The *content* of faculty member's teaching is evident in their overall course design. Evidence of teaching content excellence is documented in course syllabi, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, and/or the Faculty Information System (FIS). Quantity-based measures of teaching excellence pertaining to content include the number of new preparations and the number of substantive course revisions. Quality-based indicators of teaching excellence related to content include ensuring course- and unit- level student learning outcomes are developed for each course, selecting and including relevant readings and instructional materials in teaching activities, and aligning course content with the requirements of the discipline's regulatory bodies (e.g., the Association for Behavior Analysis and Behavior Analysis Certification Board) and

associated standards (e.g., program accreditation, verified course sequences [e.g., Board Certified Behavior Analyst and/or Culturo-Behavior Science] specifications when appropriate.

### **Process**

The teaching process includes those activities that faculty members engage in to deliver the aforementioned content. The teaching process includes instructional delivery inside and outside of the classroom; the associated activities arranged for students to engage with the material and to meet the course- and unit- level objectives; and the organization and coordination of faculty-advised teaching and research labs, practica, internship activities, and other activities that involve mentoring students. Evidence of teaching process excellence is documented on course syllabi, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy, and/or the FIS. Quantity-based measures of teaching process excellence involve the organization and implementation of teaching, supervision, and mentoring activities inside and outside of the traditional classroom (e.g., practicum sites, faculty-led research labs, etc.). Quality-based measures of the teaching process excellence include the quality of instructional delivery, the use of evidence-based and innovative instructional strategies, the alignment of course- and unit-level objectives to course activities and assessments, and reflection and iterative growth of one's teaching process.

### **Outcome**

Teaching outcomes refer to the overall impact of the faculty member's teaching activities. Teaching outcomes include indicators that are important to the student, the department, the college, the university, and the discipline. Evidence of teaching outcome excellence is documented on the faculty member's curriculum vitae, on the FIS, and on student satisfaction assessments and survey instruments. The diversity of training opportunities and experiences available to students is a hallmark of our degree programs that serves as a marker for excellence within the discipline and a strong attractor for high quality students seeking such diversity of training opportunities in their academic and professional development. Quantity-based measures have been designed with this consideration in mind. Quantity-based measures of teaching outcome excellence include the total number of students enrolled in regularly scheduled courses; the total number of semester credit hours generated through student participation and enrollment in regular courses as well as theses, dissertation, special problem, practica, and internship courses; the number of student thesis, dissertation, and comprehensive examination committees on which one serves; the number of students supervised in discipline-regulated practical and research-based training experiences (e.g., BACB practicum supervision, CBS course sequence experiential component, etc.) or other practical training experiences related to the discipline; and the number of presentations and publications with student co-authors. The quantity-based outcome measures will be considered within a context that considers enrollment, the faculty member's rank, the faculty member's focus/specialty area, the faculty member's workload assignment, and the faculty member's accomplishments in other domains. Quality-based measures of teaching outcome excellence include SPOT scores and additional social validity measures. Other quality-based measures of teaching outcome excellence include presentations and/or publications related to excellence in pedagogy; however, this metric does not apply to non-tenure track faculty in Lecturer positions.

### **Evaluation Process & Measures**

Teaching excellence will be assessed on an annual basis (unless otherwise indicated), prior to promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure or promotion for all Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; all Assistant, Associate, and Research Professors; all Assistant, Associate, and Clinical Professors; as well as Senior and Principal Lecturers in the Department of Behavior Analysis. Evidence of teaching effectiveness will be gathered from several sources included (but not limited to) course syllabi, the

faculty member's curriculum vitae and/or the FIS, the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy, and measures of student satisfaction. Information gathered from each of these sources will be scored according to the criteria specified on the Teaching Excellence Evaluation Rubric. Each dimension of teaching effectiveness (content, process, and outcome) will be scored as Developing, Proficient, or Expert according to the quality and quantity indicators previously described and further detailed on the Teaching Excellence Evaluation Rubric. Finally, an overall Teaching Excellence categorical and numeric score will be calculated and recorded.

The evaluation of Teaching Excellence will be completed by the individual faculty member and the internal peer review processes will be completed by the Department of Behavior Analysis (see attached rubric).

**Responsibilities of the individual faculty member.** In addition to their course syllabi (ideally uploaded to the FIS), the individual faculty member should gather the following information related to teaching excellence each calendar year:

***Content-based measures:***

1. The number of new course preparations
2. The number of course revisions each calendar year

***Process-based measures:***

1. A faculty-led research lab description and activity update,
2. A list and description of university, community, and disciplinary collaborations resulting in opportunities for students (e.g., practicum sites, internships, etc.),
3. A statement of teaching philosophy

***Outcome-based measures:***

1. The number of students enrolled in, and semester credit hours generated by regularly scheduled courses,
2. The number of students and semester credit hours generated through student participation and enrollment in theses, dissertations, special problems, practicum, and internship courses,
3. The number of student theses, dissertation, and comprehensive examination committees on which one serves,
4. The number of students supervised in discipline-regulated practical and research-based training experiences (e.g., BACB practicum supervision, CBS course sequence experiential component, etc.), or other practical training experiences related to the discipline,
5. The number of presentations and publications that include student co-authors
6. SPOT scores
7. The number of presentations and/or publications related to excellence in pedagogy (Tenure track faculty only)
8. Additional social validity measures

***Additional measures:***

1. Recognition of exemplary teaching and/or mentoring within or outside of the university
2. The number of invited presentations related to pedagogical methods or

- outcomes
3. The faculty member's teaching portfolio

**Responsibilities of the Department (internal peer review).** The Department of Behavior Analysis will gather evidence of teaching process effectiveness via internal peer review during bi-annual program retreats during which individual faculty member's course syllabi will be discussed and evaluated according to the Teaching Excellence Evaluation Rubric. The Department will gather the following information related to teaching excellence via internal peer review each calendar year:

***Content-based measures:***

1. Course- and unit- level student learning outcomes are included in each course,
2. Course readings and instructional materials are relevant to the course content,
3. Course content aligns with the requirements of the discipline's regulatory bodies (e.g., the Association for Behavior Analysis and Behavior Analyst Certification Board) and associated standards (e.g., program accreditation, verified course sequences [e.g., Board Certified Behavior Analyst and/or Culturo-Behavior Science] specifications when appropriate.

***Process-based measures:***

1. Faculty member's use of evidence-based and innovative instructional strategies,
2. Course- and unit-level objectives correspond to course activities and assessments.

**Criteria for Demonstrating Teaching Excellence**

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in Teaching as indicated by favorable evaluations across the teaching content-, process-, and outcome-based measures described here within. If a faculty member exhibits a sustained pattern of non-excellence in teaching (across two or more evaluation periods), the department chair, faculty mentor, and faculty member will convene to develop and initiate a professional development plan.

The specific criteria for promotion from one rank to the next is delineated below for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers; Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professors; and Research Assistant, Research Associate, and Research Professors:

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor***

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching in Years 2 through 6 of the probationary period. Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars; coordination and implementation of research and teaching labs; mentoring students across several different research- and practice-based activities such as advising students on thesis and dissertation research, supervising students in practice and internships, etc. The Department expects candidates moving from Assistant to Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in the three dimensions (content, process, and outcome) along which teaching performance is assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of proficient requires measurable course- and/or unit-level objectives that relate to the official course description and/or course content in their syllabi for all regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Additionally, course content must align with the course description, course

outcomes, and/or disciplinary requirements (as appropriate). Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students are consistently engaged with the material and have opportunities to practice skills when appropriate, and that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities. Mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range. Candidates for promotion and tenure should also provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in their teaching activities.

### ***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor***

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires candidates to demonstrate continued excellence in teaching during their tenure as Associate Professor. Evidence of continued excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars; coordination and implementation of research and teaching labs; mentoring students across several different research- and practice-based activities such as advising students on thesis and dissertation research, supervising students in practica and internships, etc. The Department expects candidates moving from Associate to Full Professor to be evaluated as expert in at least two of the three dimensions and to be evaluated as at least proficient in the remaining dimension (content, process, outcome) along which teaching performance is assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of expert requires measurable course- and unit-level objectives in their regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Course content should relate to the official course description, course objectives, and disciplinary requirements (as appropriate) and be arranged from a component-composite perspective. Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students show high levels of engagement with the material. Additionally, mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range. Candidates for promotion should also provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in their teaching activities such that course activities, linked to course objectives and assessment activities are used to inform future course design. Candidates moving from Associate to Full Professor are also expected to explore new teaching strategies and to be innovative in their course design. Associate Professors are also expected to be instrumental in mentoring students and junior faculty in developing teaching excellence.

### ***Teaching Criteria for Post-tenure Review***

The Department expects continued demonstration of teaching, mentoring, and supervision excellence. Full and Associate Professors are expected to lead department initiatives for applications for teaching and training grants, mentor Assistant and Associate Professors, conduct peer reviews of student teaching, support, and lead program evaluation efforts, and co/team-teach both within and across disciplines.

### ***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer***

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching for at least three consecutive years (or have evidence of demonstrated excellence over an equivalent duration in prior teaching experience[s]). Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. The Department expects candidates moving from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer to be evaluated as at least proficient in the three dimensions (content, process, and outcome) along which teaching performance is assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of proficient requires measurable course- and/or unit-level objectives that relate to the official course description and/or course content in their syllabi for all regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Additionally, course content must align with the course description, course outcomes, and/or disciplinary requirements (as appropriate). Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students are consistently engaged with the material and have opportunities to practice skills when appropriate, and that course activities are linked to course

objectives and assessment activities. Mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range. Candidates for promotion should also provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in their teaching activities.

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Senior to Principal Lecturer***

Promotion from Senior to Principal Lecturer requires candidates to demonstrate continued excellence in teaching for at least five consecutive years, including at least three years at the senior lecturer rank and/or the equivalent professional teaching experience. Evidence of continued excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. In addition, candidates for promotion should provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in teaching activities such that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities that are used to inform future course design, and that course design includes innovative and evidence-based strategies. The Department expects candidates moving from Senior to Principal Lecturer to be evaluated as expert in at least two of the three dimensions and as at least proficient in the remaining dimension (content, process, outcome) along which teaching performance is assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of expert requires measurable course- and unit-level objectives in their regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Course content should relate to the official course description, course objectives, and disciplinary requirements (as appropriate) and be arranged from a component-composite perspective. Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students show high levels of engagement with the material. Additionally, mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range.

***Teaching Criteria for Continuing Principal Lecturers***

The Department expects continued demonstration of teaching, mentoring, and supervision excellence. In addition to maintaining the performance necessary for promotion to Principal Lecturer, Principal Lecturers are also expected to explore new teaching strategies and to be innovative in their course design, which might include efforts to design, implement, and test novel and innovative teaching strategies. Further, Principal Lecturers are expected to be instrumental in mentoring Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in developing teaching excellence, assisting them with understanding the role of their courses in the larger degree program, providing training and support to incorporate innovative and evidence-based teaching strategies, and conducting peer reviews of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer teaching (when appropriate). Moreover, Principal Lecturers are expected to support and lead program evaluation efforts, considering not only the design and effectiveness of their own courses but also how courses contribute to the degree program as a whole.

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor***

Clinical faculty's primary role in the Department of Behavior Analysis is in teaching structured courses in any of the four degree programs offered by the Department. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching for at least three consecutive years (or have evidence of demonstrated excellence over an equivalent duration in prior teaching experience[s]). Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. The Department expects candidates moving from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in the three dimensions (content, process, and outcome) along which teaching performance will be assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of proficient requires measurable course- and/or unit-level objectives that relate to the official course description and/or course content in their syllabi for all regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Additionally, course content must align with the course description, course outcomes, and/or disciplinary requirements (as

appropriate). Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students are consistently engaged with the material and have opportunities to practice skills when appropriate, and that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities. Mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range. Candidates for promotion should also provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in their teaching activities.

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor***

Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor requires candidates to demonstrate continued excellence in teaching for at least five consecutive years, including at least three years at the Clinical Associate Professor rank and/or equivalent professional teaching experience. Evidence of continued excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. In addition, candidates for promotion should provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in teaching activities such that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities that are used to inform future course design, and that course design includes innovative and evidence-based strategies. The Department expects candidates moving from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor to be evaluated as expert in at least two of the three dimensions and as at least proficient in the remaining dimension (content, process, outcome) along which teaching performance will be assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of expert requires measurable course- and unit-level objectives in their regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Course content should relate to the official course description, course objectives, and disciplinary requirements (as appropriate) and be arranged from a component-composite perspective. Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students show high levels of engagement with the material. Additionally, mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range.

***Teaching Criteria for Continuing Clinical Professors***

The Department expects continued demonstration of teaching, mentoring, and supervision excellence. In addition to maintaining the performance necessary for promotion to Clinical Professor, faculty in this rank are also expected to explore new teaching strategies and to be innovative in their course design, which might include efforts to design, implement, and test novel and innovative teaching strategies. Further, Clinical Professors are expected to be instrumental in mentoring other junior faculty in developing teaching excellence, assisting them with understanding the role of their courses in the larger degree program, providing training and support to incorporate innovative and evidence-based teaching strategies, and conducting peer reviews of clinical faculty (where appropriate). Moreover, Clinical Professors are expected to support and lead program evaluation efforts, considering not only the design and effectiveness of their own courses but also how courses contribute to the degree program as a whole.

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor***

Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching for at least three consecutive years (or have evidence of demonstrated excellence over an equivalent duration in prior teaching experience[s]). Evidence of sustained excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. The Department expects candidates moving from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in the three dimensions (content, process, and outcome) along which teaching performance will be assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of proficient requires measurable course- and/or unit-level objectives that relate to the official course description and/or course content in their syllabi for all regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Additionally, course content must align with the course description, course

outcomes, and/or disciplinary requirements (as appropriate). Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students are consistently engaged with the material and have opportunities to practice skills when appropriate, and that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities. Mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range. Candidates for promotion should also provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in their teaching activities.

***Teaching Criteria for Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor***

Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor requires candidates to demonstrate continued excellence in teaching for at least five consecutive years, including at least three years at the Research Associate Professor rank and/or equivalent professional teaching experience. Evidence of continued excellence in teaching occurs in the design and delivery of structured courses and seminars. In addition, candidates for promotion should provide evidence of reflection and iterative growth in teaching activities such that course activities are linked to course objectives and assessment activities that are used to inform future course design, and that course design includes innovative and evidence-based strategies. The Department expects candidates moving from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor to be evaluated as expert in at least two of the three dimensions and as at least proficient in the remaining dimension (content, process, outcome) along which teaching performance will be assessed. As indicated in the rubric, a rating of expert requires measurable course- and unit-level objectives in their regularly scheduled teaching assignments. Course content should relate to the official course description, course objectives, and disciplinary requirements (as appropriate) and be arranged from a component-composite perspective. Teaching practices should be well planned and organized, ensuring that students show high levels of engagement with the material. Additionally, mean student evaluations of teaching should fall within the good to excellent range.

***Teaching Criteria for Continuing Research Professors***

The Department expects continued demonstration of teaching, mentoring, and supervision excellence. In addition to maintaining the performance necessary for promotion to Research Professor, faculty in this rank are also expected to explore new teaching strategies and to be innovative in their course design, which might include efforts to design, implement, and test novel and innovative teaching strategies. Further, Research Professors are expected to be instrumental in mentoring other junior faculty in developing teaching excellence, assisting them with understanding the role of their courses in the larger degree program, providing training and support to incorporate innovative and evidence-based teaching strategies, and conducting peer reviews of clinical faculty (where appropriate). Moreover, Research Professors are expected to support and lead program evaluation efforts, considering not only the design and effectiveness of their own courses but also how courses contribute to the degree program as a whole.

**Scholarship**

The Department of Behavior Analysis expects excellence in scholarship and seeks to promote a culture of systematic and continuous discovery, invention, application, and practice. The Department recognizes that scholarship is a wide and open-ended category and, therefore, strives to recognize a variety of activities as contributing to the scholarship mission of the unit if it can be shown to engage the conceptual framework of behavior analysis. Faculty members engage in scholarship when they conduct empirical research and/or conduct secondary data analyses, conceptual and theoretical investigations, or reviews of the empirical or conceptual literature. Faculty members also engage in scholarship when they share their research with a wider audience (e.g., the community or general public), engage in interdisciplinary collaborations in research, or engage in any other scholarly activities that contribute to



the development of new knowledge or the application of new or existing knowledge to solve socially relevant problems. The Department expects and encourages faculty members to create programmatic lines of research that involve students as collaborators and are potentially competitive for support via governmental agencies, foundations, or other community partners. Finally, the Department encourages and supports intra-, inter-, and trans-disciplinary collaboration at all levels where appropriate.

Scholarship activities can be assessed along two dimensions – process and outcome – that can be evaluated in terms of their quantity and quality. The scholarly activities that correspond to each dimension, followed by the types of evidence that will be gathered to support the assessment of the quality and quantity of scholarly excellence are as follows.

### **Process**

The process dimension of scholarship refers to activities that lead to or facilitate the production of valued scholarly outcomes (see below). Examples include creating recurring opportunities for student involvement in projects, holding regular lab meetings, maintaining compliance with IRB and IACUC requirements, applying for grants and/or contracts, and any other activity that directly or indirectly contributes to the effectiveness of the faculty member's program of research. Evidence of excellence in scholarship process will be documented via FIS, and via a faculty member's research statement indicating process-related activities such as initiating or maintaining active IRB or IACUC protocols or applying for grants and/or contracts. Quantity-based measures of excellence in scholarly process include the number of publications (including student co-authored publications), the number of contracts and/or grant applications submitted through UNT's Office of Research and Innovation, the number of active IRB and/or IACUC protocols and the number of current research projects associated with each, the number of interdisciplinary collaborations, etc. Quality-based measures of excellence in the scholarly process include demonstration of a thematic connection in the activities in which faculty members allocate scholarship time and effort.

### **Outcomes**

Scholarship outcomes refer to the products that result from the research process. Scholarship outcomes include three traditional categories grants, publications, and presentations. Other desired outcomes of scholarship activities include financial support for students and the development of a scholarly reputation. Evidence of scholarship outcome excellence is documented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, and in the faculty member's research statement. Quantity-based and quality-based measures for each of the three traditional categories are described below. Metrics are also described for the categories of student support and scholarly reputation. All stated metrics will be evaluated holistically and take qualitative and quantitative aspects of the faculty member's performance into account.

For Publications, quantity-based measures include the number of publications as well as the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the work represented in the publication and the percentage of the faculty member's contribution to the publication itself. Quality-based measures in this category will include the journal's composite standing in a ranking system that uses a combination of factors in determining a journal's rank (e.g., e.g., [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com)). If a journal is not ranked or indexed by the agreed upon ranking system, the faculty member can identify other factors such as relative impact factor, journal's acceptance rate, and/or the number of years the publication has been in operation to attest to the quality of the journal.

For Grants, quantity-based measures include the number of grant applications submitted through the Office of Research and Innovation and the number of grants and amount of money received. Quality-based measures include the faculty member's role on the grant application (PI, Co-PI,

subcontractor, etc.), the type of agency (foundation, state, federal), and evidence of thematically related applications, as well as whether the grant applications were selected for funding.

For Presentations, quantity-based measures include the number of presentations made and the number of symposia or panel discussions organized. Quality-based measures include the faculty member's role in the presentation (presenting or not, lead author or not), whether the presentation was invited, and the scope of the organization (regional, national, or international).

For the Student Support category, quantity-based measures include the number of students supported via grants or contracts secured by the faculty member and the number of student-driven grants submitted and/or funded.

For the scholarly reputation category, quantity-based measures include the number of editorial appointments; the number of invitations to speak or present a keynote address; the number of invitations to serve on boards, panels discussions, or other scholarly committees outside UNT; the number of invitations to serve on theses or dissertations outside the department; and any other outcome that the faculty member can defend as an indicator of their scholarly reputation.

### **Evaluation Process & Measures**

Scholarship excellence will be assessed on an annual basis (unless otherwise indicated), prior to promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure or promotion for all Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; all Assistant Clinical, Associate Clinical and Clinical Professors; and all Assistant Research, Associate Research, and Research Professors in the Department of Behavior Analysis. The expectations for scholarship will be commensurate with the type of appointment and the proportion of the workload allocated to scholarship. Evidence of scholarship effectiveness will be gathered from several sources including (but not limited to) the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, the faculty member's research statement and ancillary documents (as described above). Each dimension of scholarship effectiveness (process and outcome) will be scored as Developing, Proficient, or Expert according to the quality and quantity indicators previously described and further detailed on the Scholarship Excellence Evaluation Rubric. Finally, an overall Scholarship Excellence categorical and numeric score will be calculated and recorded.

The evaluation of Scholarly Excellence will be completed by the individual faculty member and internal peer review processes will be completed by the Department of Behavior Analysis.

**Responsibilities of the individual faculty member.** The individual faculty member should gather the following information related to scholarship excellence each calendar year:

#### ***Process-based measures:***

1. Number of contracts/grants submitted through the Office of Research and Innovation
2. Number of IRB and/or IACUC protocols
3. Number of current research projects associated with each IRB and/or IACUC protocol (when appropriate if, for example, one IRB covers multiple studies)
4. Number of Behavior Analysis Research Colloquia (BARCs)

#### ***Outcome-based measures for publications:***

1. Number of publications
2. The journal's rank as reported in external ranking system
3. Percentage of contribution and/or additional indicators as described above for each publication
4. Diversity of contribution (i.e., empirical, conceptual, review, other)

***Outcome-based measures for grants/contracts:***

1. Number of grants and/or contracts received
2. Per Grant, number of funded student lines earned through contracts and/or grants
3. Per Grant, the type of funding (e.g., grant/contract, internal/external)
4. Per Grant, the funding source (e.g., federal, state, local, foundation, other)
5. Per Grant, the faculty member's role with respect to the funding (Primary Investigator [PI], Co-PI, contributor, contractor, etc.)
6. The number of thematically related applications

***Outcome-based measures for presentations:***

1. Number of presentations
2. The type of presentation (e.g., invited and/or keynote, speaking and/or non-speaking role, faculty and/or student-led presentations, peer reviewed/non-peer reviewed)
3. The scope of the organization (regional, national, international)
4. The disciplinary reputation of the host organization

***Outcome-based measures for scholarly reputation***

1. Number and types of editorial positions held
2. Number of invited and keynote addresses (including those invitations that are declined)
3. Number of invitations to serve on boards, committees, or panels
4. Number of invitations to serve on theses and dissertations outside of the Department of Behavior Analysis
5. Number of other invitations that the faculty member sees as indicators of one's scholarly reputation

***Outcome-based measures for student support***

1. Number of students supported and the source of support

***Additional measures:***

1. Number of non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., invited contributions to scholarly, newsletters, blog posts, book chapters, books, edited books, etc.)

**Responsibilities of the Department.** The Department of Behavior Analysis will gather evidence of scholarly excellence via internal peer review during annual merit review during which individual faculty member's excellence will be discussed and evaluated according to the Scholarship Excellence Evaluation Rubric. The Department will gather the following information related to scholarly excellence via internal peer review each calendar year:

1. The faculty member's CV and/or FIS report
2. The faculty member's research statement
3. Additional/ancillary documents as provided by the individual faculty member

**Criteria for Demonstrating Scholarly Excellence**

All Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; all Assistant Research, Associate Research, and Research faculty; and all Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Professors are expected to demonstrate excellence in Scholarship as indicated by favorable evaluations across the scholarship process-, and outcome-based measures described herein. If a faculty member

exhibits a sustained pattern of non-excellence in scholarship (across two or more evaluation periods), the department chair and faculty member will convene to develop and initiate a professional development plan.

The specific criteria by which Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; all Assistant Research, Associate Research, and Research faculty; and all Clinical Assistant Professors, Clinical Associate Professors, and Clinical Professors will be evaluated are further delineated as follows:

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor***

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship in their probationary period except for the first year in which faculty members are expected to establish laboratories and protocols. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support or facilitate the development and maintenance of an effective program of research and in the conduct of research leading to valued scholarly outcomes. Candidates moving from Assistant to Associate Professor must be evaluated as at least proficient in the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship process and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, faculty members must have established a programmatic and focused line of research with demonstrated mechanisms for student involvement, maintain active publication records (an average of 2 peer-reviewed publications per year over the probationary period, two-thirds of which must appear in journals ranked as “Q1” or “Q2” by an external ranking system (e.g., [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com)), active presentation records (1 per year), and show evidence of efforts to obtain external funding to be rated proficient.

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor***

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship during the entirety of their post-tenure appointment in the Department. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support the continued maintenance of an effective and programmatic line of research or the development of new programs of research and in the conduct of research leading to valued scholarly outcomes. Candidates moving from Associate to Full Professor must be evaluated as at least expert in the areas of scholarship processes and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, faculty members must have developed a national or international scholarly reputation for research in their area of specialization, have established a programmatic and focused line of research with demonstrated mechanisms for student involvement, maintain active publication records (an average of 2 peer-reviewed publications per year, two-thirds of which must appear in journals ranked as “Q1” or “Q2” by an external ranking system (e.g., [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com)), presentation records (>1 per year), and have secured foundation, state, or federal level funding in support of their research agendas totaling a minimum of \$25,000.00 from a combination of external sources. Evaluation of a candidate’s portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Post-tenure Review***

The Department expects continued excellence in scholarship processes and outcomes during the post-tenure appointment. Associate and Full Professors are expected to not only sustain the aforementioned requirements indicated for promotion to their rank but also to advance their established research agendas, continue affirming their scholarly reputation, advance the discipline, and continue to seek external funding. In terms of established rubrics, the Department expects Associate and Full professors to retain expert status on at least one of the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship process and outcomes. In addition, the Department expects Associate and Full professors to be guides and mentors for junior faculty in the Department, supporting Assistant Professors and other non-tenured faculty in moving their scholarship endeavors forward toward excellence (e.g., co-

authoring publications, serving as co-PIs on grant applications, developing joint contracts, coordinating shared scholarly endeavors such as co-editing books and chapters, coordinating special sections/issues of journals, etc.). Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor***

Promotion from Research Assistant to Research Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship in their initial three-year probationary period. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support or facilitate the development and maintenance of an effective program of research and in the conduct of research leading to valued scholarly outcomes. Candidates moving from Research Assistant to Research Associate Professor must be evaluated as at least proficient in the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship process and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, faculty members must have established a programmatic and focused line of research with demonstrated mechanisms for student involvement, maintain active publication record (an average of 3 peer-reviewed publications per year, two-thirds of which must appear in journals ranked as "Q1" or "Q2" by an external ranking system (e.g., [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com))), presentation records (1 per year), and show evidence of efforts to obtain external funding (1 federal, state, or foundation grant application per year) to be rated proficient. Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor***

Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship for a period of five years at the rank of Research Associate Professor or have equivalent prior relevant experience. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support or facilitate the development and maintenance of an effective program of research and in the conduct of research leading to valued scholarly outcomes. Candidates moving from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor must be evaluated as expert in the areas of scholarship processes and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, faculty members must have developed a national or international scholarly reputation for research in their area of specialization, have established a programmatic and focused line of research with demonstrated mechanisms for student involvement, maintain active publication records (an average of 3 peer-reviewed publications per year, two-thirds of which must appear in journals ranked as "Q1" or "Q2" by an external ranking system (e.g., [www.scimagojr.com](http://www.scimagojr.com))), presentation records (>1 per year), and have secured external funding processed through the Office of Research and Innovation in support of their research agendas exceeding \$50,000.00. Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Continuing Research Associate Professor or Research Professor***

The Department expects continued excellence in scholarship processes and outcomes during the post-tenure appointment. Research Associate Professors and Research Professors are expected to not only sustain the aforementioned requirements indicated for promotion to their rank but also to advance their established research agendas, continue affirming their scholarly reputation, advance the discipline, and continue to seek external funding. In terms of established rubrics, the Department expects Research Associate Professors and Research Professors to retain expert status on at least one of the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship process and outcomes. In addition, the Department expects Research Associate Professors and Research Professors to be guides and mentors for junior

faculty in the Department, supporting Assistant Professors and other non-tenured faculty in moving their scholarship endeavors forward toward excellence (e.g., co-authoring publications, servicing as co-PIs on grant applications, developing joint contracts, coordinating shared scholarly endeavors such as co-editing books and chapters, coordinating special sections/issues of journals, etc.). Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor***

Clinical faculty fulfil an important instructional role in the Department of Behavior Analysis. As such, clinical faculty are not expected to develop the independent lines of research characteristic of tenure-track and Research faculty. Given the focus on instruction and pedagogy, the scholarship clinical faculty engage in is likely to include strategies to improve teaching practices and student outcomes. The expectation is that research productivity will be commensurate with the amount of effort allocated toward research and scholarship. Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship in their initial three-year probationary period. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support or facilitate existing research programs in the department or in the generation of new knowledge related to pedagogy or professional practice. Candidates moving from Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor must be evaluated as at least proficient in the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship processes and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, clinical faculty members must maintain an active publication (an average of one peer-reviewed publication every 2 years) and presentation record (an average of one peer-reviewed presentation every two years). There is not an expectation that Clinical faculty will develop an independent line of research or to secure grant or contract funding from external agencies. Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor***

Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in scholarship for a period of five years at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or have equivalent prior relevant experience. Evidence of sustained excellence in scholarship is found in activities that support or facilitate the development and maintenance of an effective program of research or in the generation of new knowledge related to pedagogy or professional practice. Candidates moving from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor must be evaluated as at least proficient in the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship processes and outcomes. As indicated in the rubric, faculty members must maintain an active publication (an average of one peer-reviewed publication every 2 years) and presentation record (an average of one peer-reviewed presentation every 2 years). There is not an expectation that Clinical faculty will develop an independent line of research or to secure grant or contract funding from external agencies. Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

***Scholarship Criteria for Continuing Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor***

The Department expects continued excellence in scholarship processes and outcomes during the post-tenure appointment. Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors are expected to not only sustain the aforementioned requirements indicated for promotion to their rank but also to support and facilitate research agendas, advance the discipline, and continue affirming their scholarly reputation when appropriate. In terms of established rubrics, the Department expects Clinical Associate Professors

and Clinical Professors to retain proficient status in at least one of the quality indicators that correspond to scholarship process and outcomes. In addition, the Department expects Clinical Associate Professors and Clinical Professors to be guides and mentors for junior faculty in the Department, supporting Assistant Professors and other non-tenured faculty in moving their scholarship endeavors forward toward excellence (e.g., co-authoring publications and coordinating shared scholarly endeavors such as co-editing books and chapters on pedagogy). Evaluation of a candidate's portfolio will be conducted in a holistic manner which will evaluate publications, grants, presentations, and other professional activities in an integrated manner.

### **Service**

The Department of Behavior Analysis expects excellence in service and seeks to promote a culture of active participation in the business of the Department, the College, and the University. In addition, the Department expects the faculty to be actively involved in shepherding the discipline and serving other external constituencies when possible and reasonable. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional, disciplinary, or community task, priority, or initiative.

The service activities of faculty members in the Department of Behavior Analysis will be categorized into one of three all-encompassing and mutually exclusive categories: Institutional, Disciplinary, and Community. Activities in each of the three categories will be evaluated along quantitative and qualitative dimensions.

#### **Institutional**

Service activities that contribute to the operation of the Department, the College, or the University are categorized as Institutional. Examples include serving on standing or ad-hoc department-level committees, serving as coordinators of degree programs, taking the lead on ad-hoc departmental initiatives, serving on standing or ad-hoc college or university level committees, and other similar otherwise uncompensated efforts that contribute to the operations of the university and its components. Evidence of excellence in Service is documented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, and a self-descriptive statement about service commitments. Additional evidence of excellence in Service may be found via letters of acknowledgement, official commendations, certificates of participation, or any other documentation attesting to the faculty member's uncompensated contribution to the mission of the group. Quantity-based measures of service excellence in this domain include the number of departmental, college or university level committees in which the faculty member participates. Quality-based measures in this domain include leadership roles on the committees or the overall impact of the activities on the mission of the group. Activities that are directly compensated, above expenses-incurred, may not be counted as contributions to this category.

#### **Disciplinary**

Service activities that contribute to the maintained operation or growth of the discipline are categorized as Disciplinary. Examples include serving on editorial boards; disciplinary boards, committees, or task forces for disciplinary bodies such as the Association for Behavior Analysis, International or its chapters; and/or as subject matter experts or leading ad-hoc initiatives for local, state, regional, national, or international organizations committed to behavior analysis. Many other uncompensated activities may be categorized as disciplinary if the activities can be seen to contribute, directly or indirectly, to the growth or maintenance of the discipline. Evidence of excellence in Service is documented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, and a self-descriptive statement about the service commitments. Additional evidence of excellence in Service may be found via letters of acknowledgement, official commendations, certificates of participation, or any other documentation

attesting to the faculty member's uncompensated contribution to the mission of the group. Quantity-based measures of service excellence in this domain include the number of commitments the faculty member has to disciplinary bodies (e.g., journals, local, state, regional, national, and international organizations) and other institutions committed to the growth and sustainability of behavior analysis. Quality-based measures in this domain include the coherence of the faculty member's long-term research and practice goals with their choice of service assignments in the disciplinary category. Other measures include the potential impact of the activity on the growth and sustainability of the discipline. Activities that are directly compensated, above expenses-incurred, may not be counted as contributions to this category.

### **Community-Oriented**

Service activities that contribute to organizations not connected to UNT or to disciplinary organizations are categorized as Community-Oriented. Examples include activities such as consulting and developing infrastructure and materials for groups and organizations for which such service is intrinsically related to the professional competence of the faculty member. Evidence of excellence in Service is documented in the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, and a self-descriptive statement about the service commitments. Additional evidence of excellence in Service may be found via letters of acknowledgement, official commendations, certificates of participation, or any other documentation attesting to the faculty member's uncompensated contribution to the mission of the group. Quantity-based measures of service excellence in this domain include the number of performance-commitments the faculty member has with community partners. Quality-based measures in this domain include the coherence of the faculty member's expertise or career-development plans with their choice of service assignments in the Community-Oriented category. Other measures include the potential impact of the activity on the growth and sustainability of the discipline. Activities that are directly compensated, above expenses-incurred, may not be counted as contributions to this category.

### **Evaluation Process & Measures**

Service excellence will be assessed on an annual basis (unless otherwise indicated), prior to promotion and/or tenure or promotion for all Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; Senior and Principal Lecturers; Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professors; and non-tenured Research faculty in the Department of Behavior Analysis. Evidence of service contributions will be gathered from several sources including, but not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the FIS, and a self-descriptive statement about the service commitments. Information gathered from each of these sources will be scored according to the criteria specified on the Service Excellence Evaluation Rubric. Service will be scored as Developing, Proficient, or Expert according to the quality and quantity indicators previously described and further detailed on the Service Excellence Evaluation Rubric. The quantity-based measures will provide an assessment of the individual faculty member's level of involvement in each activity while the quality-based measures will provide an assessment of the importance and impact of the service to the individual faculty members professional development, and the mission of the institution (university, college, department), discipline, and/or community.

### **Responsibilities of the individual faculty member.**

Faculty members should prepare/update a statement of service that includes a brief statement regarding their roles and responsibilities in the service commitment(s) and the impact(s) or potential impact(s) of the endeavor(s) on the related institutions or organizations. In the case of disciplinary service, the faculty member's statement should indicate the alignment between their long-term research or practice aspirations and their choice of service assignment(s). In the case of community-oriented service, the faculty member's statement should indicate the alignment between their



established expertise or career-development plans and their choice of service assignment(s). In addition, the individual faculty members should gather the following information related to service excellence each calendar year:

***Institutional service***

**Quantity**

1. Number of service commitments at departmental, college, or university level.

**Quality**

2. A description of roles and responsibilities in the commitments
3. A brief statement of impact

***Disciplinary service***

**Quantity**

1. Number of service commitments to disciplinary constituencies

**Quality**

2. A description of roles and responsibilities in the commitments
3. A brief statement of impact

***Community-oriented service***

**Quantity**

1. Number of community partners

**Quality**

2. A description of roles and responsibilities in the commitments
3. A brief statement of impact

***Other evidence of service excellence***

1. Letters of commendation
2. Recognition and rewards
3. Citations or awards received
4. Media-based (e.g., newspapers, social media, tv, etc.) articles and announcements featuring the service activity

**Responsibilities of the Department.** The Department of Behavior Analysis will gather evidence of service excellence via internal peer review during the annual merit review process during which individual faculty member's service performance will be discussed and evaluated according to the Service Excellence Evaluation Rubric and via the faculty member's self-statement related to service activities. The Department will gather the following information related to service excellence via internal peer review and faculty self-reports each calendar year:

***Quantity-based measures:***

1. Number of service commitments across the institution, discipline, and community

***Quality-based measures:***

1. Self-statement regarding roles and responsibilities for each service assignment
2. A description of the impact or potential impact of the service activities

### **Criteria for Demonstrating Service Excellence**

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in Service as indicated by favorable evaluations across the measures described above. If a faculty member exhibits a sustained pattern of non-excellence in service (across two or more evaluation periods), the department chair, faculty mentor, and faculty member will convene to develop and implement a professional development plan.

The specific criteria by which Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors; Lecturers, Senior, and Principal Lecturers; Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professors; Research Assistant, Research Associate and Research Professors will be evaluated are further delineated as follows:

### **Service Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in service during their probationary period excluding the first year of their employment. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional, disciplinary or community task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates moving from Assistant to Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in two of the three domains of service (institutional, disciplinary, and community-oriented) with a high impact activity in at least one of the three domains in which they are evaluated. Service activities in the disciplinary and community-oriented domains should be strategically related to long term research trajectory or plans for career development.

### **Service Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in service during the entirety of their post-tenure period prior to application for full professor. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional, disciplinary or community task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates moving from Associate to Full Professor to be evaluated as at least expert in two of the three domains of service (institutional, disciplinary, and community-oriented) with high impact activities in at least two of the three domains and leadership role(s) in at least one of the three domains in which they are evaluated. Service activities in the disciplinary and community-oriented domains should continue to be strategically related to long term research trajectory or plans for career development.

### **Service Criteria for Post-tenure Review**

The Department expects sustained excellence in service during the faculty member's tenure as Associate or Full Professor. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional, disciplinary or community task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates, post-tenure at the level of Associate or Full Professor, to be evaluated as at least expert in one of the three domains of service (institutional, disciplinary, and community-oriented) along which they will be evaluated with a high impact activity in at least one of the three domains and a leadership role(s) in at least one of the three domains in which they are evaluated. Service activities in the disciplinary and community-oriented domains should be strategically related to long term research trajectory or plans for career development.

### **Service Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor, and Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor**

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, or from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor requires

candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in service for at least three consecutive years. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates moving from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in the Institutional domain of service only. The Department expects candidates moving from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor to be evaluated as at least proficient in the Disciplinary domain of service only.

**Service Criteria for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer, Research Associate Professor to Research Professor, and Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor**

Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer, from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor, or from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor requires candidates to demonstrate sustained excellence in service for at least five consecutive years, including at least three years at the Senior Lecturer, Clinical Associate Professor, or Research Associate Professor ranks. Faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates moving from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer or from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor to be evaluated as at least expert in the Institutional domain of service only. The Department expects candidates moving from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor to be evaluated as at least expert in the Disciplinary domain of service only.

**Service Criteria for Continuing Senior and Principal Lecturers, Associate Research and Research Professors, and Associate Clinical and Clinical Professors**

The Department expects sustained excellence in service during the faculty member's tenure as Senior or Principal Lecturer, Associate Research or Research Professor, or Associate Clinical or Clinical Professor. Non-tenured faculty members engage in service when they allocate otherwise uncompensated effort toward an institutional task, priority, or initiative. The Department expects candidates at the Senior and Principal Lecturer or Associate Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor levels to be evaluated as at least expert in the Institutional domain of service only. The Department expects candidates at the Associate Research Professor or Research Professor levels to be evaluated as at least expert in the Disciplinary domain of service only.

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

Teaching Content: Quantity-Based Indicator(s)			
<b>Number of new course preparations and course revisions</b>	_____ New Preparations	_____ Course Revisions	
Teaching Content: Quality-Based Indicator(s)			
	Developing (0-1)	Proficient (2-3)	Expert (4-5)
<b>Course- and/or unit-level outcomes are developed for each course</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course-level outcomes are not included in one or more course syllabi AND/OR</li> <li>Course-level outcomes are included but are not measurable in one or more syllabi AND/OR</li> <li>Course-level outcomes are included but do not relate to official course description or course content in one or more syllabi</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course-level outcomes are included in course syllabi</li> <li>Course-level outcomes are measurable</li> <li>Course-level outcomes are included and relate to official course description and/or course content AND/OR</li> <li>Unit-level outcomes are included in course syllabi (or are available to students)</li> <li>Unit-level outcomes are measurable</li> <li>Unit-level outcomes are included and relate to official course description and/or course content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course- and unit-level outcomes are included in course syllabi (or are available to students)</li> <li>Course- and unit-level outcomes are measurable</li> <li>Course- and unit-level outcomes are included and relate to official course description and/or course content AND</li> <li>A component-composite relation between unit- and course-level outcomes is evident</li> </ul>
<b>Course content aligns with the course description, course outcomes, and disciplinary requirements (as appropriate)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course content in one or more syllabi do not align with the course description AND/OR</li> <li>Course content one or more syllabi do not align with the course outcomes AND/OR</li> <li>Course content one or more syllabi do not align with the disciplinary requirements (as appropriate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course content aligns with the course description AND/OR</li> <li>Course content aligns with the course outcomes AND/OR</li> <li>Course content aligns with the disciplinary requirements (as appropriate)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course content aligns with the course description AND</li> <li>Course content aligns with the course outcomes AND</li> <li>Course content aligns with the disciplinary requirements (as appropriate)</li> </ul>

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** *Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.*

**Evaluation Summary & Numeric Score for Teaching Content Excellence:**

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

Teaching Process: Quantity-Based Indicator(s)			
<b>Teaching, supervision, and mentoring activities are organized and implemented inside and outside of the classroom (e.g., practicum, faculty-led research labs, etc.)</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">_____ Does not engage in teaching, supervision, and/or mentoring activities inside the classroom            _____ Engages in teaching, supervision, and/or mentoring activities inside and outside of the classroom            _____ Consistently engages in teaching, supervision, and mentoring activities inside and outside of the classroom</p>		
Teaching Process: Quality-Based Indicator(s)			
	Developing (0-1)	Proficient (2-3)	Expert (4-5)
<b>Instructional Design &amp; Delivery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching practices are not sufficiently planned or organized, or are poorly implemented</li> <li>Practices are not well executed, little development in methods despite evidence of need</li> <li>Students lack opportunities to practice the skills embedded in course goals</li> <li>Student engagement is variable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teaching practices are well planned and organized</li> <li>Standard course practices carried out; follows conventions within discipline and institution</li> <li>Students have some opportunities to practice skills embedded in course goals</li> <li>Students consistently engaged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities are well planned, integrated, and reflect commitment to providing meaningful assignments and assessments</li> <li>Uses effective, high-impact or innovative methods to improve understanding</li> <li>In- and out-of-class activities provide opportunities for practice and feedback on important skills and concepts</li> <li>Students show high levels of engagement</li> </ul>
<b>Course activities and assessments are linked to course- and unit-level objectives</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course activities and assessments are not linked to course- and unit-level objectives OR</li> <li>Course activities are not linked to course- and unit-level objectives OR</li> <li>Course assessments are not linked to course- and unit-level objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course activities are linked to course- and unit-level objectives OR</li> <li>Course assessments are linked to course- and unit-level objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course activities and assessments are linked to course- and unit-level objectives</li> </ul>

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<p><b>Reflection &amp; Iterative Growth</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No indication of having reflected upon or learned from prior teaching or feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued competent teaching, possibly with minor reflection based on input from peers and/or students</li> <li>• Articulates some lessons learned from prior teaching and feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularly adjusts teaching based on reflections on student learning, within or across semesters</li> <li>• Examines student performance following adjustments</li> <li>• Reports improved student achievement of learning goals based on past course modifications</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

**Evaluation Summary & Numeric Score for Teaching Process Excellence:**

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

Teaching Outcome: Quantity-Based Indicator(s)	
Faculty Member-Specific Information	<p>_____ rank</p> <p>_____ focus/specialty area</p> <p>_____ workload percentage – teaching</p>
Number of students enrolled in regularly scheduled courses and semester credit hours generated	<p>_____ number of regularly scheduled courses    _____ total enrollment after add/drop dates</p> <p>_____ total semester credit hours generated through regularly scheduled courses</p>
Number of students and semester credit hours generated through thesis, dissertation, special problems, practicum, and internship courses	<p>_____ thesis    _____ dissertation</p> <p>_____ special problems    _____ practicum    _____ internship</p>
Number of student committees	<p>_____ thesis    _____ dissertation    _____ comprehensive examination</p>
Number of students supervised	<p>_____ discipline-regulated practical training experiences</p> <p>_____ research-based training experiences</p>
Number of presentations and publications that include student co-authors	<p>_____ presentations    _____ publications</p>



**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Teaching Outcome: Quality-Based Indicator(s)</b>			
	<b>Developing (0-1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2-3)</b>	<b>Expert (4-5)</b>
<b>SPOT scores</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mean of less than 3.5</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mean of 3.5 to 4</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mean of 4 or greater</li> </ul>
<p><b>Presentations and/or publications related to excellence in pedagogy</b></p> <p><i>Note: this does not apply to non-tenure track faculty including Lecturers, Clinical faculty, and Research faculty</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No interaction with broader community about teaching</li> </ul> <p>AND/OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not relevant or would detract from the faculty member's primary line of research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interacts with the broader community about teaching through teaching-related presentations</li> </ul> <p>_____Local _____State</p> <p>_____National _____International</p> <p>Other _____</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scholarship of teaching and learning is the faculty member's primary line of research</li> </ul> <p>AND/OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interacts with the broader community about teaching through teaching-related publications</li> </ul> <p>Journals and impact factors _____</p> <p>Journals and number of subscribers _____</p> <p>Publication and number of citations _____</p>
<b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Numeric Score for Teaching Outcome Excellence:</b>			

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Additional Indicator(s) of Teaching Excellence</b>	
<b>Recognition of exemplary teaching and/or mentoring within or outside of the university</b>	
<b>Invited presentations related to pedagogical methods or outcomes</b>	
<b>Maintains an updated teaching portfolio</b>	
<b>Other</b>	
<b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Multiplier for Additional Indicators of Teaching Excellence:</b>	

**Evaluation of Teaching Excellence:** Teaching activities can be evaluated according to three dimensions - content, process, and outcome - that can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of teaching excellence provide an overarching context by which the candidate's teaching excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

**Overall Numeric Score for Teaching Excellence:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Summary & Rationale:**

**Faculty member name and signature:**

**Date:**

**Department chair name and signature:**

**Date:**

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. **\*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.**

<b>Scholarship: Quantity-Based Indicator(s)</b>	
<b>Faculty Member-Specific Information</b>	_____ rank _____ focus/specialty area _____ workload percentage – scholarship
<b>Outcome Measures</b>	
_____ Number of publications _____ Number of grants and/or contracts received _____ Number of presentations _____ Number of externally funded student lines	_____ Number of student co-authored publications _____ Number of invitations (present, panel, board member, etc.) _____ Number of student-driven grants submitted
<b>Publications</b> - for each publication note the journal impact factor or alternative, the number of citations, the percentage of contribution, the type of contribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide full citation for each publication indicating year of publication, journal name, volume, issue, and page numbers.</li> <li>• Provide the current impact factor for each journal (or for the year of the publication)</li> <li>• Provide the number of citations and other measures of impact</li> <li>• Describe the type (empirical, conceptual, etc) and amount (percent) of contribution for each publication</li> </ul>

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. **\*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.**

<p><b>Grants</b> - for each grant/contract received indicate the type of funding, the funding source, the faculty member's role, the continuity of funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide full title of the grant submission and the date the grant was submitted</li> <li>• Identify the mechanism and the agency to which the grant was submitted</li> <li>• Identify your role on the grant and indicate the amount for which you are responsible, total amount and the duration of the grant</li> </ul>
<p><b>Presentations</b> - for each presentation note the type of presentation, the presentation audience, and the disciplinary reputation of the presentation venue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full title of presentation, the date of presentation, and the conference in which the talk is presented.</li> <li>• Indicate the type of presentation (poster, address, panel discussion)</li> <li>• Identify role in presentation (presenter or supporting)</li> <li>• Provide some indication of the reputation of the conference</li> </ul>
<p><b>Scholarly reputation</b> – list the number and type of editorial positions, number of invitations (presentations, board memberships, panels, guest teacher, outside thesis or dissertation member</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List editorial roles; list other leadership roles in the discipline</li> <li>• List number of invitations to present or speak</li> <li>• List invitations to serve as outside members of theses or dissertations</li> <li>• Provide any other information that is indicative of a positive scholarly reputation in the discipline</li> </ul>

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. \*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.

### Process Measures

\_\_\_ Number of contracts/grants submitted

\_\_\_ Number of active IRB and/or IACUC protocols and associated research projects

\_\_\_ Number of Behavior Analysis Research Colloquia (BARCs).

\_\_\_ List other activities that directly or indirectly support research agenda (e.g., intra-, inter-, or trans-disciplinary collaborations)

### Evaluation Summary & Numeric Score for Quantity-Based Indicators of Scholarship Excellence:

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. **\*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.**

<b>**Scholarship: Quality-Based Indicator(s)</b>			
	<b>Developing (0-1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2-3)</b>	<b>Expert (4-5)</b>
<b>Process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is not a thematic connection evident in the breadth and scope of scholarly activities</li> <li>There are no connections between contracts and/or grant applications, active IRB and/or IACUC protocols and/or current research projects AND/OR</li> <li>There are no connections between the aforementioned activities and the focus of the research lab(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an emerging thematic connection among scholarly activities</li> <li>There is a connection between contracts and/or grant applications, active IRB and/or IACUC protocols and/or current research projects OR</li> <li>There is a connection between the aforementioned activities and the focus of the research lab(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a thematic connection among scholarly activities</li> <li>There is a connection among contracts and/or grant applications, active IRB and/or IACUC protocols and/or current research projects AND</li> <li>There is a connection between the aforementioned activities and the focus of the research lab(s)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome: Publications</b></p> <p><i>Tenure-track faculty</i></p> <p><i>Provisions for Research Faculty indicated with *</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 2 peer-reviewed journal publications per year OR</li> <li>Only peer-reviewed journal publications are manuscripts under review OR</li> <li>Peer-reviewed journal publications are in only low-quality journals, are not cited by others, and/or include only secondary analyses of the literature</li> </ul> <p><u>Research Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Less than 3 peer-reviewed journal publications per year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintains an active publication record (average 2 per year) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses AND</li> <li>Publications are in journals ranked as being in the top 50% (at least Q2) in external ranking system OR</li> <li>Publications are in high quality, established journals as measured by acceptance rates and age of publishing company</li> </ul> <p><u>Research Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Maintains an active publication record (3 per year) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintains an active publication record (&gt;2 average per year) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses AND</li> <li>Publications are in journals ranked as being in the top 50% (at least Q2) in external ranking system OR</li> <li>Publications are in high quality, established journals as measured by acceptance rates and age of publishing company</li> </ul> <p><u>Research Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Maintains an active publication record (&gt;3 per year) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses</li> </ul>

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. **\*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.**

<p><i>Provisions for Clinical Faculty indicated with **</i></p>	<p><u>Clinical Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>**Less than 1 peer-reviewed journal publications every two years</li> </ul>	<p><u>Clinical Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>**Maintains an active publication record (1 pub every two years) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses</li> </ul>	<p><u>Clinical Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>**Maintains an active publication record (&gt;1 pub every two years) that includes empirical and review papers in addition to secondary analyses</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome: Grants</b></p> <p><i>Provisions specific to research faculty are indicated with *</i></p> <p><i>There are no grant-related expectations for clinical faculty</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No applications for external funding were submitted</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No attempts were made to secure contract funding</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not attend grant workshops or trainings or cultivate mentorship opportunities related to securing external funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regularly attends grant workshops or trainings and cultivates mentorship opportunities related to securing external funding</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An active agenda to obtain external funding through grant applications or attempts to secure contract funding is evident</li> </ul> <p><u>Research Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Submit at least one grant application per year to an external agency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An active agenda to obtain external funding through grant applications or attempts to secure contract funding is evident <b>(grants are submitted)?</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One or more of these applications or contracts was funded</li> </ul> <p><u>Research Faculty</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Submit more than one grant application per year OR one or more of the applications are successful.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Outcome: Presentations</b></p> <p><i>These provisions are the same for tenure-track faculty and non-tenure track research faculty</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No presentations were made or organized</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations were restricted in scope of the organization or role (e.g., non-speaking/presenting role)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An active presentation agenda is evident (at least 1 per year)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations include speaking/presenting roles</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations represent a diversity in the scope of the organization (e.g., regional, national, international)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An active presentation agenda is evident (&gt; 1 per year)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations include speaking/presenting roles</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations represent a diversity in the scope of the organization (e.g., regional, national, international)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentations are largely invited and/or keynote presentations</li> </ul>



**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** *Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. \*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.*

**Evaluation Summary & Numeric Score for Quality-Based Indicators of Scholarship Excellence:**

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. **\*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.**

Additional Indicator(s) of Scholarly Excellence	
Non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., invited contributions to scholarly, newsletters, blog posts, book chapters, books, edited books, etc.)	
Other	
Evaluation Summary & Multiplier for Additional Indicators of Scholarly Excellence:	

Overall Numeric Score for Scholarship Excellence: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluation Summary & Rationale:

**Evaluation of Scholarly Excellence:** Scholarly activities can be evaluated according to outcome and process; processes establish best practices for attaining outcomes. This rubric should be utilized in a manner informed by the sub-specialty and unique demands/aspiration of the faculty member's application. The department expects that various specialties will require various emphases on areas within outcome and process rubrics; evaluators are encouraged to scale their evaluation in this manner to emphasize the subsections most important for the faculty member's sub-specialty. \*\*Quality (numeric) indicators are based on a workload of 40% scholarship. The grid also indicates additional requirements for non-tenure track Research Faculty that are based on their larger allocation of workload to Scholarship.

**Faculty member name and signature:**

**Date:**

**Department chair name and signature:**

**Date:**

**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

Service: Quantity-Based Indicator(s)	
<b>Faculty Member-Specific Information</b>	_____rank _____focus/specialty area _____ workload percentage – service
<b>Number of service activities and positions held</b>	<p><b><u>Institutional:</u></b></p> <p>_____ University Positions: _____</p> <p>_____ College Positions: _____</p> <p>_____ Department Positions: _____</p> <p><b><u>Disciplinary:</u></b></p> <p>_____ Editorial Activity Positions: _____</p> <p>_____ Activity related to Associations, conferences, etc. Position: _____</p> <p><b><u>Community-oriented:</u></b></p> <p>_____ Activities Positions: _____</p> <p>_____ Board Memberships Positions: _____</p>

**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Institutional Service: Quality-Based Indicator(s)</b>			
	<b>Developing (0-1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2-3)</b>	<b>Expert (4-5)</b>
<p><b>Institutional relevance and impact</b></p> <p><i>Service requirements for Lecturers and Clinical Faculty are evaluated according to this domain only</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not engage in service activities at the institutional (i.e., university, college, and/or department) level</li> <li style="text-align: center;">OR</li> <li>• Engages service activities at the institutional level as a member of committee(s)</li> <li style="text-align: center;">AND</li> <li>• Institutional activities are not relevant or impactful to the institutional mission and/or accomplishments</li> <li style="text-align: center;">OR</li> <li>• Institutional activities are relevant to the institutional mission and/or accomplishments but are not impactful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in service activities at all three institutional levels as member of committee(s)</li> <li style="text-align: center;">AND</li> <li>• Institutional activities are relevant and impactful to the institutional mission and/or accomplishments</li> <li style="text-align: center;">OR</li> <li>• Engages in service activities at the institutional level as a leader of the committee(s)</li> <li style="text-align: center;">AND</li> <li>• Institutional activities are relevant and impactful to the institutional mission and/or accomplishments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in multiple service activities at the institutional level as a leader of the committee(s)</li> <li style="text-align: center;">AND</li> <li>• Institutional activities are relevant and impactful to the institutional mission and/or accomplishments</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Numeric Score for Institutional Service Excellence:</b></p>			

**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Disciplinary Service: Quality-Based Indicator(s)</b>			
	<b>Developing (0-1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2-3)</b>	<b>Expert (4-5)</b>
<p><b>Disciplinary relevance and impact</b></p> <p><i>Service requirements Research Faculty are evaluated according to this domain only</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not engage in service activities at the disciplinary level OR</li> <li>• Engages service activities at the disciplinary level as a member of committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are not relevant or impactful to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments OR</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are not connected to the faculty member's long term professional interests OR</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are impactful but not relevant to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in service activities at the disciplinary level as a member of the committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are relevant and impactful to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments OR</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are connected to the faculty member's long term professional interests AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are relevant and impactful to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in multiple service activities at the disciplinary level as a leader of the committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are relevant and impactful to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are not connected to the faculty member's long term professional interests</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Numeric Score for Disciplinary Service Excellence:</b></p>			

**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Community Service: Quality-Based Indicator(s)</b>			
	<b>Developing (0-1)</b>	<b>Proficient (2-3)</b>	<b>Expert (4-5)</b>
<b>Community relevance and impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not engage in service activities at the community level OR</li> <li>• Engages service activities at the community level as a member of committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Community-based activities are not relevant or impactful to the community organization's mission and/or accomplishments OR</li> <li>• Community-based activities are not connected to the faculty member's expertise or to plans for career development • OR</li> <li>• Community-based activities are impactful but not relevant to the disciplinary organization's mission and/or accomplishments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in service activities at the community level as a member of the committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Community-based activities are connected to the faculty member's expertise or to plans for career development AND</li> <li>• Community-based activities are relevant and impactful to the community organization's mission and/or accomplishments OR</li> <li>• Engages in service activities in the community as a leader of the committee(s) AND</li> <li>• <u>Community-based activities are relevant, impactful to the community organization's mission and/or accomplishments</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engages in multiple service activities in the community as a leader of the committee(s) AND</li> <li>• Disciplinary activities are relevant and impactful to the community organization's mission and/or accomplishments</li> <li>• Community-based activities are connected to the faculty member's expertise or to plans for career development</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Numeric Score for Community Service Excellence:</b>			

**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

<b>Other evidence of Service Excellence</b>	
<b>Letters of commendation regarding service activity participation</b>	
<b>Recognition and rewards for service activities</b>	
<b>Citations or awards received for service activities</b>	
<b>Media-based (e.g., newspapers, social media, tv, etc.) articles and announcements featuring service activities</b>	
<b>Other</b>	
<b>Evaluation Summary &amp; Multiplier for Additional Indicators of Service Excellence:</b>	



**Evaluation of Service Excellence:** Service activities can be evaluated according to quality- and quantity-based measures. Quantity-based indicators of service excellence provide an overarching assessment of the level of involvement by which the candidate's service excellence might be evaluated while quality-based indicators provide an overarching assessment of the significance and scope of impact of the work. In combination, service can be assessed from a developmental framework ranging from developing to expert.

**Overall Numeric Score for Service Excellence:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Summary & Rationale:**

**Faculty member name and signature:**

**Date:**

**Department chair name and signature:**

**Date:**