

Scholarship Standards

School of Psychology, Family and Community

Start Date: Spring 2021 (approved by Faculty Affairs spring 2021)

End Date: Summer 2024

Professional Scholarship in the Context of SPFC

Original standards approved by Faculty Affairs Committee, 12 December 2005

First revision approved by Faculty Affairs Committee: 9 May 2011

Second revision approved by Faculty Affairs Committee: 28 October 2014

Current revision approved by Faculty Affairs Committee: 26 May 2015

COVID Addendum, through summer 2024: In situations where pandemic-related delays affect publications in the final stages of revision, such products should count equally with published works in consideration for tenure. Faculty in this situation should provide documentation of editorial communication, similar to documentation for completed publications.

Although applications may vary, all programs in SPFC seek to integrate theory, research and practice, and contribute to the knowledge base in their particular fields. All programs seek to graduate students who combine holistic views of persons with evidentially-based interpretations and applications of behavior. Faculty members in marriage and family therapy or clinical psychology in particular seek to be and to train therapists and clinicians who are guided by values of sensitivity, respect, and curiosity, and who draw on scientific theory and research, general world knowledge, acute observational skills, and open, critical stances toward the mental health concerns they face.¹ Rigorous scholarship, in other words, defines not simply what one produces, but also how one practices.

SPFC's discipline-specific standards reflect two primary sources of criteria or guidelines: The SPU *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.2.2, and the accreditation standards of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy and the American Psychological Association. SPFC's standards are designed to meet both the expectations of the handbook and the professional performance necessary to achieve and maintain secondary accreditation in marriage and family therapy and clinical psychology. For reference, the accreditation standards and the departmental operationalizations are presented in the section following.

Accreditation Standards:

1. The Department of Marriage and Family Therapy (MFT). MFT adheres to the Standards (version 11.0) of the Committee on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Education (COAMFTE). Those standards of particular relevance to this SPFC document follow:

Standard II-A "The program resides in an environment that encourages faculty teaching, scholarship, service, and practice in keeping with the educational outcomes..."

Standard II-G "Faculty members are academically, professionally, and experientially qualified and sufficient in number to achieve educational outcomes..."

Standard II-H "The faculty roles in teaching, scholarship, service, and practice are identified clearly and are congruent with the educational outcomes..."

Standard IV-D “Faculty outcomes demonstrate achievement of the program’s educational outcomes, and enhance program quality and effectiveness.”

MFT operationalizes these standards as follows: All full-time faculty and many of our part-time faculty [will] publish in guild journals and present their work at national conferences regularly. They will reinforce theoretical study by emphasizing projects, field-based activities, clinical experience and professional engagement with

¹ See Trierweiler, S.J., & Stricker, G. (1998). *The scientific practice of professional psychology*. New York, New York: Plenum Press.

organizations. They will also maintain clinical practices and provide professional clinical supervision services.

2. Department of Clinical Psychology (CPY). CPY adheres to the standards of the American Psychological Association Committee on Accreditation (APA CoA). That is, “Psychological practice is based on the science of psychology, which, in turn, is influenced by the professional practice of psychology” (APA, 2003, CoA Self-Study Instructions for Doctoral Programs, Domain B.1.a., p. 7). Implicit in APA CoA guidelines are the expectations that current program faculty are to remain active in professional memberships, professional honors, publications (scholarly articles, books and/or book chapters), presentations to major professional or scientific groups, grants or training contracts, or other professional (peer-reviewed) activities.

3. Department of Industrial/Organizational Psychology (IOP): No secondary accreditation for graduate training is currently in effect in the field of industrial/organizational psychology; however, both our degree programs at SPU were designed in accordance with the *Guidelines for Education and Training at the Master and Doctoral Levels in Industrial/Organizational Psychology* prepared by the Education and Training Committee of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP). Approved by the American Psychological Association, August 1999. SIOP is Division 14 of the American Psychological Association and an “Organizational Affiliate” of the American Psychological Society. Similar to CPY, it is expected that IOP faculty members will demonstrate continuing activity in most of the domains noted by the APA Committee on Accreditation (see above).

4. Department of Psychology (PSY): No secondary accreditation is relevant to undergraduate Psychology; however, our program at SPU is designed to meet the academic and experiential criteria delineated in The American Psychological Association’s (2010) “Principles for Quality Undergraduate Education in Psychology” that came out of the National Conference on Education in Undergraduate Psychology. This document is the most recent in a series of recommendations from the APA Board of Educational Affairs about how undergraduate psychology programs should be structured and what goals they should seek to address. Similar to CPY, it is expected that Psychology faculty members will demonstrate continuing activity in most of the domains noted by the APA Committee on Accreditation (see above).

SPFC Discipline-Specific Standards for Promotion and Tenure: Professional Activity/Professional Scholarship

1.0 The basic principle underlying *professional activity* in SPFC is that tenure-track faculty members (.75 to full-time) will *engage annually with their respective guilds*.²

² Guilds include but are not limited to the professional disciplines in which faculty members earned their doctorates. Professional activities of faculty members may be multidisciplinary in focus and as such cross into multiple guilds.

2.0 Professional activity relevant to SPFC includes professional scholarship, clinical practice, clinical supervision, consulting, supervising research, leading workshops, public speaking, reviewing manuscripts for professional journals, filling roles in professional organizations, and so on.³ In addition to scholarship, consulting and clinical supervision and practice will be described in greater detail due to their unique place in a *scholarship of application* (see Section 2.3 below) and their unique relevance in a school offering professional graduate degrees.

2.1 Licensed faculty participating in clinical practice and providing clinical supervision are engaged in professional activities of particular note. Nationally accredited programs require that their clinical faculties be licensed. External peer review is required to achieve and maintain licensure and/or clinical supervisor status. Supervision of clinicians or therapists-in-training carries a level of responsibility and liability unique in academia. Finally, maintaining licensure requires that an active clinical practice be sustained; this activity is above and beyond other responsibilities expected of all university faculty members.

2.2 Professional consultation services off-campus are also professional activities requiring particular attention. Evidence of professional excellence in consultation is demonstrated (1) by publishing results of consultation work in peer-reviewed guild journals or scholarly texts; or (2) by providing evidence that the consultation work is a) based in current research, b) critical to the success of the client organization or individual, c) demonstrates application of high level skills and competencies, and d) places the faculty member in a managing or senior consultation role. In cases where the results of consultation work cannot be released in the public domain (e.g., where organizations claim proprietary rights to data resulting from consultations), it is the faculty member's responsibility to seek independent, external, and doctoral-level peer review of personally authored or co-authored in-house publications or work completed in the course of consultation.

2.3 Professional scholarship (defined primarily as research and writing) may be in any of the four domains derived from Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990)⁴ but with particular application to SPU (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.2.2.2): (1) Discovery, (2) Teaching (i.e., research on teaching), (3) Application, and (4) Synthesis.

³ Where these activities fit in the four performance criteria of the SPU *Faculty Handbook* (Section 5.2) will depend on specific circumstances. For example, consulting may be considered under *Scholarship* as a professional activity if the recipient is a professional or academic organization (e.g., participating on a site-visit team for an accreditation evaluation), or it may be *Service* in the community or church if the recipient is a local non-profit. Likewise, supervising research may be considered under *Teaching* if the recipient is a student, or it may fit under *Character and Congruence with the Mission* as evidence of collegiality if the recipient is an academic peer. It is the faculty member's prerogative and responsibility to place and justify the placement of professional activities under the performance criteria. The department chair and the SPFC faculty committee will evaluate how compelling the faculty member's case is, and this will then be communicated to the school dean and the Faculty Status Committee.

⁴ Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Princeton University Press.

2.3.1 In terms of scholarly products, engagement with the guild needs to include some form of external peer review⁵ and includes but is not limited to the following:

- Principal author⁶ of peer reviewed scholarly presentations at national or international conferences valued by relevant guilds (or their equivalent).
- Principal author of published articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed guild journals.
- Principal author of chapters in editor and/or peer-reviewed scholarly texts.
- Principal author of editor and/or peer-reviewed scholarly texts.
- Principal author of research grants, if the grants obtained lead to scholarly productivity as described in the four bullets above.
- Principal author of published articles in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals or texts which “investigate the relationship of Christian theology and tradition to particular disciplinary issues” (*Faculty Handbook*, Section 5.2.2.2, Scholarship of Synthesis). One example is the *Journal of Psychology and Theology*.

In the above scholarly products, greater weight usually will be given to presentations at national or international conferences than to presentations at local or regional conferences, to published works than to conference presentations or grant applications, to published works in higher-tiered journals or texts,⁷ and to published works in journals or texts of greater clinical usefulness. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to present evidence for the rigor and/or professional value of the journal or other literary outlet, and the department chair and the SPFC faculty committee’s responsibility to evaluate how compelling the faculty member’s case is. This will then be communicated to the school dean and the Faculty Status Committee. Department needs will determine in part the relative mix of scholarly products sought in any designated period of time, with the department chair discussing expectations with faculty members through the annual PDP process.

2.3.2 Co-authorship is also valued and will contribute positively to the body of evidence for promotion or tenure. Co-authorship indicates that the faculty member is in productive collaborative roles with peers. Of even greater significance is when co-

⁵ Peer review is “external” in that it must be independent of the author. It may take on many forms, the most common and rigorous of which is multiple, independent and “blind” reviewers. Other forms may include multiple editors of a text, or editor review of proposals submitted in a competitive call for manuscripts. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to present evidence for the rigor of the review process, and the department chair and the SPFC faculty committee’s responsibility to evaluate how compelling the faculty member’s case is. This will then be communicated to the school dean and the Faculty Status Committee.

⁶ Principal authorship implies a substantial amount of responsibility and work on a manuscript. Most commonly this is evidenced in the position of first author. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to present evidence of principal authorship when not first author of a multi-authored publication. The department chair and the SPFC faculty committee will evaluate how compelling the faculty member’s case is. This will then be communicated to the school dean and the Faculty Status Committee.

⁷ “Tiering” as used here refers to the level of scholarly rigor required of the author for inclusion in the publication of interest. Given the vast range of potential scholarly journals or texts in which SPFC faculty may publish, a comprehensive list is unrealistic.

authorship is indicative of mentoring roles with colleagues or students. Generally, co-authorship will be given less weight than principal authorship; however, department or school needs may increase the weight of this role, as in the mentoring noted above.

2.3.3 Scholarly trajectory must be demonstrated by all faculty members. That is, they are expected to identify a research area or areas, in which they will (1) establish particular professional expertise and (2) contribute to the body of knowledge in the field. They are also expected to articulate a trajectory of scholarly research and writing projects into the future. This trajectory will be explicitly addressed in both the self evaluation of past performance and the development plan for future performance in the annual PDP process.

2.3.4 Minimum levels for promotion in rank:

2.3.4.1 Promotion to Instructor normally occurs when Lecturers advance into the ranked faculty. A candidate for the rank of Instructor may be able to offer little significant evidence of accomplishment in the discipline. In such a case, the applicant may emphasize the steps being taken to begin professional development, and letters of support may evaluate the apparent potential of the individual as a scholar (*Faculty Handbook*, 1997, Section 6.3.2.1).

2.3.4.2 Promotion to Assistant Professor (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section 6.3.1).

2.3.4.3 Promotion to Associate Professor (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section 6.3.2).

2.3.4.4 Promotion to Professor (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section 6.3.3).

2.4 Minimum expectations for professional activity of tenure-track faculty. All SPFC tenure-track faculty members must regularly engage in a variety of professional activities, such as those listed in Section 2.0 of this document. Regarding scholarly productivity in particular, all tenure-track faculty members must produce on average a conference presentation annually and a peer-reviewed publication every third year.

2.4.1 Faculty members with primary departmental assignments in graduate programs. The *Faculty Handbook*, Section 11.1.1.2 stipulates that faculty members with primary departmental assignments in graduate programs are “expected to devote more time to professional development activities” than faculty members with primary departmental assignments in the undergraduate program. In general for SPFC faculty members with primary departmental assignments in graduate programs, the minimum quantity of scholarly products is on average a conference presentation annually and a peer-reviewed publication every two years. Clinical supervision by licensed faculty members and/or consultation work may be applied to meet this higher standard of professional activity if it fulfills the criteria delineated in Section 2.1 or 2.2 above.

3.0 It is important to note that the preceding paragraphs describe minimums necessary for *eligibility* to be considered for advancement. They do not guarantee that advancement will be forthcoming. Advancement is based on evaluation of a faculty member's body of work and supporting evidences.

4.0 Beyond these minimums, expectations for individual faculty will vary according to her/his particular skills, interests, and program needs. These expectations will be discussed and made explicit with the department chair through the annual PDP process.