As described in PPS 7.22, Faculty Responsibilities, the Department of Psychology may from time to time convert lecturer positions to senior lecturer positions, when these positions help fulfill the teaching mission and obligations of the department. Under this policy for these identified positions, a nationwide search will not be necessary for the conversion of the specified position.

**Eligibility for Conversion**: Lecturers who are eligible will generally have taught full-time for the Department of Psychology for three years (or less with an exceptional performance). In all cases the lecturer will have established in fine record in teaching

**Procedure:**

1) The applicant shall notify the department chair of his/her intent to apply for a Senior Lecturer position and will present a Texas State Resume and all available teaching evaluations for the last three years to the chair.

2) If the chair concurs with the application, the chair will notify the Personnel Committee (PC) members of the application for the position of senior lecturer, and PC members will review the resume and teaching evaluations of the applicant.

3) The chair will call a PC Meeting to consider the application. If a majority of the PC members approve of the application for senior lecturer, the chair will then take the appropriate administrative steps to facilitateation the position conversion.

4) Within two weeks of the PC Meeting, the chair will notify the applicant of the PC Meeting outcome.
Policy Statement on
Employment of Faculty without Terminal Degrees

Texas State University-San Marcos
Department of Psychology

Preface

The usual terminal degree in Psychology is a PhD in Psychology or, for Counseling or Statistics/Methodology, a PhD or EdD in Educational Psychology. In the area of clinical psychology, the PsyD, the Doctor of Psychology degree, is also an acceptable terminal degree. For courses in the undergraduate Forensic Psychology minor, a JD is also considered a terminal degree. Additional related degrees include doctorates in Child Development (for Developmental Psychology), Neuroscience (for Brain and Behavior or Sensation and Perception), or Management (for Industrial-Organizational Psychology).

Statement of Purpose

It is the policy of the Department of Psychology to hire only faculty holding the PhD or in certain cases other terminal degrees such as the JD, EdD, or PsyD. Special circumstances may from time to time require employment of faculty who do not hold the terminal degree, but only according to the guidelines in this policy statement, which are consistent with those of the College of Liberal Arts.

Credentials of Graduate Faculty

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requires the following:

Faculty teaching graduate and post-baccalaureate course work: earned doctorate / terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.

In nearly every case, faculty who teach graduate courses in the Department of Psychology must adhere to this guideline.

Exceptions

Exceptions are rare and available only to faculty who demonstrate extraordinary skills, credentials, and experience appropriate to the discipline. An example of a justifiable exception would be an individual holding a masters’ degree who possesses extensive experience working in the areas of clinical, counseling, or industrial psychology or who has made extraordinary scholarly contributions to the psychological literature.
All exceptions must receive approval from the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the Provost.

**Credentials of Undergraduate Faculty**

SACS requires the following credentials of all undergraduate faculty:

*Faculty teaching baccalaureate courses: doctor’s or master’s degree in the teaching discipline or master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline). At least 25 percent of the discipline course hours in each undergraduate major are taught by faculty members holding the terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate—in the discipline.*

**Exceptions**

Individuals holding a non-terminal degree may be employed in the Department of Psychology to teach undergraduates when they meet the SACS requirements and when one or more of the following conditions apply:

1. Student demand that surpasses the departmental supply of available faculty holding terminal degrees
2. Emergency replacement of a faculty member who holds a terminal degree but is unable to perform assigned teaching duties
3. Program’s need to teach specialized subjects when faculty with terminal degrees are not available
4. Need for specialized instructional tasks (such as supervising internships or teachers seeking certification) when faculty with terminal degrees are not available
5. An individual holding a masters’ degree possesses extensive experience working in the areas of clinical, counseling, or industrial psychology, has an applicable professional license, or has made extraordinary scholarly contributions to the psychological literature

All exceptions must receive the approval of the departmental chair and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

**Evaluation and Continued Employment**

The departmental chair, faculty review and personnel committees regularly evaluate all faculty who lack a terminal degree. Continuing employment requires the approval of the departmental chair and the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.
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Introduction

The faculty is responsible, in part, for fulfilling the mission of Texas State University. Our collective performance influences the effectiveness of our institution. It is essential, therefore, that we evaluate our performances and cultivate actions that enhance institutional effectiveness. Therefore, faculty members should be evaluated in terms of our contribution to campus missions, and we should be rewarded for enhancing institutional effectiveness.

Tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, lecturers, faculty on voluntary modified retirement (VME), and part-time faculty in the Department of Psychology are expected to be active in three professional areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Per-course faculty members only have teaching activity responsibilities.

The primary purposes of this document are to establish guidelines for annual evaluations and list the expectations in these areas. The guidelines set forth in this document are in accordance with the following University and Liberal Arts PPS’s:

- PPS 7.05, Faculty Workload Policies
- PPS. 7.10, Procedures for Awarding Faculty Merit and Performance Raises
- PPS 7.14, Hiring and Use of Part-time and Per Course Faculty
- PPS 7.18 Clinical Faculty Appointments
- PPS 8.01, Development/Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty;
- PPS 8.09, Performance and Evaluation of Faculty and Post-tenure Review;
- PPS 8.11, Performance Evaluation of Non Continuing Adjunct Faculty;
- Liberal Arts PPS 2.01, Annual Review/Evaluation & Merit Performance; and
- Liberal Arts PPS 2.02, Tenure and Promotion

Annual faculty evaluations are important because of the following:

- They provide information useful for self-development;
- They help to identify, reinforce, and share the strengths of the faculty;
- They extend opportunities for continuous professional development;
They help to identify and strengthen the role of each faculty member in serving the goals of the department; and,

They provide information which may be used in tenure and promotion recommendations, the awarding of performance and merit raises, and decisions regarding retention, including post-tenure review.

**Procedures for Annual Evaluation**

**Faculty Review Committee:** Because evaluation is a duty shared by departmental chairs and departmental personnel, the Psychology Department will annually convene a Faculty Review Committee.

1. The Faculty Review Committee will consist of three persons from the tenured faculty, plus one “alternate” member.

2. The Faculty Review Committee will be selected randomly from the Psychology Department’s Personnel Committee and are expected to serve two-year terms.

3. Those selected will be the first three members whose names are pulled at random. An alternate whose task it is to replace a member of the Review Committee during his or her evaluation will be the fourth member drawn randomly. No faculty member will serve on this committee for consecutive (two-year) terms, nor can faculty members be re-selected for subsequent terms until every member of the Personnel Committee has served a rotating term— excepting those Personnel Committee members who choose not to serve on the Faculty Review Committee. Any members of the Personnel Committee (hereafter, “PC”) who choose not to serve on the Faculty Review Committee (hereafter, “FRC”) can withdraw their names from consideration “without prejudice.”

4. The first task of the FRC shall consist of electing a chair for this committee (itself a subcommittee of PC). The three randomly selected members shall determine (by vote or consensus) which of the three shall serve as committee chair for the two-year committee term.

5. The FRC will examine materials submitted annually by each faculty member. Each faculty member will submit a summary of the prior year’s activities (using the College of Liberal Arts Annual Workload Report Form) and copies of the prior year’s publications. Additionally current syllabi and student evaluations are available from the departmental office. These materials (annual report and current calendar year publications) should be submitted by February 1st, and will be collected and placed in an area accessible to all members of the department. The review committee shall assign a rating of Exceeds Merit Expectations, Meets Merit Expectations, or Does not meet Expectations for each of the three areas: Teaching, Scholarship and Service. In rare instances faculty may be assigned a rating of Significantly Exceeds Merit Expectations in a category. The ratings assigned to each faculty member will be mutually agreed upon by all FRC
Role of Departmental Chair in Annual Evaluation: Because the Faculty Review Committee’s recommendations regarding the annual evaluation are advisory to the Chair, the Chair’s recommendations take precedence. Nevertheless, the Chair is obligated to hear the Committee’s recommendations, and explain any discrepancies from FRC recommendations to the FRC prior to notifying faculty about those decisions. Further, the college form for reporting results back to the faculty member reflects self-evaluation, FRC evaluation, and Chair evaluation. By March 1, the chair will provide a written performance review to all faculty members.

Appeal Process: Should a faculty member take issue with the results of the performance review, the following process should be followed.

1. The faculty member will notify the chair in writing within 10 working days of receiving official notification of the Departmental Chair’s performance review that the faculty member requests an explanation.

2. The Chair has 10 working days after having received the request for explanation to provide that explanation to the faculty member during a formal conference and in writing.

3. Should the explanation be unsatisfactory to the faculty member, a three-person Reconsideration Team will be convened to look at the faculty member’s complaint. The faculty member will select one member from the Department’s faculty, and the Chair will select a second from the FRC. The third member will be chosen by agreement of the first two Reconsideration Team members.

4. The Reconsideration Team will examine the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee and Departmental Chair. The Reconsideration Team will offer its report on the merits of the complaint to both the faculty member and the Chair within ten working days of its inception.

5. Should the faculty member and the Chair be unable to resolve the disputed performance review, the faculty member may consult the University Ombudsman for further action.

Faculty Workload Expectations

Workload decisions for upcoming semesters will be made public in the form of a schedule of classes. The schedule of classes will be available to all faculty on the Psychology Intranet at least one month prior to the start of the semester and will be sortable by faculty member. The administrative workload report, available later during the semester, will also be made available to all faculty. Faculty members who dispute the actual allocation of workload credits should meet with the Chair and offer justifications.
for an adjustment. If there is no resolution, the individual should make his or her concerns known to the Personnel Committee and ask for a recommended solution. Neither Chair nor faculty member is bound by this Committee's decision. Their input is viewed as advisement and counsel for both parties. If the faculty member remains dissatisfied, he or she should continue the appeal through procedures outlined in the University’s Faculty Handbook.

As a colleague, the professor has obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. All tenured, tenure-track, and lecturing professors are required to respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, the professor is expected to show due respect for the opinions of others, acknowledge academic debts, to strive to be objective in professional judgment of colleagues, and accepts a share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of the institution. Each faculty member is expected to carry out his or her responsibilities with integrity and support the goals of the Department, the College, and the University. A significant component of carrying out one's responsibilities with integrity involves “collegiality.” Collegiality—defined as “the capacity to relate well and constructively with one's colleagues”—is a legitimate factor for consideration in the evaluation process. The American Association of University Professors’ statement on Professional Ethics contemplates as much:

> Collegiality relates to behavior, citizenship, and fostering positive relationships in the university setting. It does not relate to expression of ideas or a mere lack of popularity. It is a legitimate criterion that protects faculty from a hostile atmosphere that is debilitating to their own potential and to the achievement of the department's goals.

Faculty members who receive workload credits for scholarship (e.g., tenured, tenure-track, and some faculty on Voluntary Modification of Employment) are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members are also encouraged to refer to the PPS 08.09 "Performance and Evaluation of Faculty and Post-tenure Review," PPS 8.01 “Development/Evaluation of Tenure-track Faculty, the Liberal Arts promotion and tenure policy (LA/PPS2.02), and the pertinent sections of the University’s Faculty Handbook for regulations and policies governing appointment, promotion, academic freedom, responsibility, tenure, due process, and other information. The Personnel Committee/FRC and the Chair are responsible for annual faculty evaluations. The Chair is responsible for assigning Faculty Workload Expectations in the Department of Psychology. The purposes of these annual evaluations and the aims of the assignment of appropriate workloads to faculty are as follows:

- To insure that appropriately qualified instructors teach all courses;
- To insure that all departmental faculty are contributing members to the overall workload for the department;
- To insure that both the university and faculty members are getting a fair and reasonable exchange of services for allocated salary dollars; and,
• To insure that all faculty members are provided adequate time and opportunity to fulfill their yearly personal and professional goals as documented through submission of the annual report.

As described in PPS 7.05 “Faculty Workload,” 12 hours of workload credit is considered the basis for fulltime faculty employment. Normally, each faculty is expected to teach four three-credit-hour classes per semester. The Chair may grant waivers for the following:

• Writing, directing and executing grants;
• Major scholarly activities;
• Supervising student teachers or graduate student interns;
• Chairing four theses over a two year period;
• Significant university related committee work or engaging in prominent professional responsibilities at the state, regional, and/or national level, for example, editor of a journal, president of SWPA or TPA, or other state, regional, national or international organizations;
• Academic advisement; and,
• Mutually agreed upon professional service and other professionally related activities as specified in PPS 7.05.

Lecturer, VME, and Part-time Faculty Workload. Lectures in the Department of Psychology are evaluated primarily on their teaching and service to the department. For lecturers, expectations in the areas of service and scholarship differ from those of tenure-track and tenured faculty. While scholarship (beyond maintaining one’s professional development) is not expected from lecturers, it may contribute to their being considered for merit in that category. VME and part-time faculty will teach courses and engage in appropriate service based upon their employment percentage.

Clinical Faculty Workload. As per PPS 7.18, Clinical Faculty in the Department of Psychology are evaluated primarily on their teaching effectiveness, professional status and activities (equivalent to scholarly activity), and practice related activities (equivalent to service activities). Effective classroom, laboratory, and/or clinical teaching is assessed by student, peer, and self evaluations designed by the faculty member's department in accordance with college policy. Professional status consists of level of education, quality and level of professional experience, and clinical/professional practice recognition and will vary by professional discipline (examples include holding office in local, state, national, or international professional associations; membership in or appointment to local, state, national, or international committees, task forces, or work groups; and publications in professional journals, newsletters, and websites.). Practice relevant activity consists of current performance in a clinical/practice setting

Per-Course Faculty are responsible only for the courses that they are assigned to teach. Their teaching materials and evaluations will be reviewed by FRC and the chair during the annual review process.
Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty Workload Options

Tenured faculty members have some flexibility in the emphases they place on teaching, scholarship, and service. They may select one of two workload options that typically reflect a two-year commitment on their part. The purposes of these options are to allow faculty a choice in how they will meet their commitments to Texas State University and how they will pursue individual career goals. The workload flexibility is designed to benefit the Department, the College and the University by increasing the likelihood that they will achieve their educational missions. The election of a workload option should not be taken lightly, and should reflect a long-term, well-articulated, self-assessment by each faculty member in consultation with the Chair.

Teaching-Service-Scholarship Option - Option A. This choice is only for tenured faculty members who are primarily interested in teaching and service. Faculty selecting this option normally will teach four sections per semester (i.e., fall and spring), provide leadership in service areas, and engage in some scholarship activities. To be eligible for merit when selecting this option (i.e., evaluated at the "meets merit expectations" level), the faculty member must demonstrate quality teaching, strong service and some activity in scholarship (i.e., at least one paper submitted each year to a regional convention).

Tenured faculty choosing either Option A or Option B may be given a workload reduction for significant teaching or service assignments, such as being an academic advisor, being a program director, being an officer in a professional organization or teaching for the first time in the teaching theater. The Dean and the Provost must approve any reduction in workload for teaching, service or administrative activities.

Those choosing Option A may receive merit raises and bonuses; however, because promotion to a higher rank is unlikely without evidence of substantial scholarship activity, faculty should not expect to be promoted to a higher rank while on this option.

Teaching-Scholarship-Service Option - Option B. This choice is for all tenured and tenured-track faculty members, who desire to teach, serve the Department, the College and the University, actively pursue scholarship interests and publish the results. Scholarship, in this case, is defined as the systematic investigation of some phenomenon. Faculty approved for Option B will be given a workload reduction to pursue their scholarship interests, and will normally teach three sections per semester. To qualify for Option B, a faculty member must indicate, using the College of Liberal Arts Annual Workload Report Form, their plans for ongoing scholarship and have that plan approved by the chair. To be evaluated as "meets merit expectations" in this option, faculty must demonstrate significant progress toward stated goals, including quality teaching, substantial scholarship contributions, and appropriate levels of service.

For purposes of evaluation, faculty members must annually provide the Chair (and the rest of the department) a description, using the College of Liberal Arts Annual Workload Report Form, of their teaching, scholarship, and service efforts. To continue in this
option, faculty members must be meeting, or showing progress toward meeting, their stated objectives. To continue in this option past the original two-year period, faculty must have produced at least one first-authored refereed publication, two co-authored refereed publications, or the equivalent, during that time period. Thereafter, faculty members choosing Option B must meet these criteria every two years. When mitigating circumstances prevent a faculty member from reaching this goal, the Chair will decide if a one-year extension will be granted. Faculty, who cannot achieve these criteria, even after a one-year extension, will be assigned to Option A until they show concrete evidence of quality scholarship activity. Those faculty members who meet the criteria to remain in Option B after being assigned to Option A, may return to Option B during the next round of course scheduling. After two years in Option A, faculty who have not yet met the criteria for Option B, but who are showing evidence of scholarship activity, may reapply for the Teaching-Scholarship-Service Option.

For tenure-track faculty, satisfying Option B requirements for merit does not guarantee meeting criteria for tenure and/or promotion.
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Decisions concerning salary, promotions, tenure, and other rewards, will be based on evaluations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service during the previous calendar year. Performance is evaluated as **Significantly Exceeds Merit Expectation** (infrequent/rare—3 points), **Exceeds Merit Expectation** (2 points), **Meets Merit Expectation** (1 point), or **Does Not Meet Expectation** (0 points) for the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

**Annual Activity-Progress Report**

All faculty members will submit an Annual Workload Report (College of Liberal Arts Form) at the end of each calendar year, by February 1. In this report, faculty members will document their professional activities for the previous calendar year and their progress toward the goals previously stated in the faculty member’s Annual Workload Report. All faculty (except for per-course faculty) are required to provide descriptions of their activities in all three areas: teaching, scholarly activities, and service. Not doing so will result in the evaluation “does not meet expectations” for a category without documentation. Per-course faculty will complete the Annual Workload Report for only the relevant teaching activities. The Faculty Review Committee (FRC) will make performance evaluation recommendations to the Chair based on departmentally approved criteria (outlined below).

Faculty should use Section 6 of the College Annual Workload Report Form to evaluate their accomplishments during the previous calendar year in comparison to their stated goals. The FRC and Chair will also use Sections 7 and 8 to evaluate the faculty member's performance, taking into account the relevant workload option. The Chair will meet briefly with each faculty member by March 1 to review his or her Annual Workload Report Form and complete his or her annual performance evaluation. Faculty members will receive on-line copies of their report after evaluation by the FRC, the Chair, and the Dean. Unless supporting materials are necessary for further performance review(s), they will be returned to the faculty member after performance decisions are made.

The FRC will provide a performance rating in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. These ratings will be **Significantly Exceeds Merit Expectations** (infrequent/rare—3 points) **Exceeds Merit Expectation** (2 points), **Meets (Merit) Expectation** (1 point), or **Does Not Meet Expectation** (0 points) for performance in each area. The FRC’s report with these ratings will be forwarded to the Chair no later than February 15. Both the FRC’s performance ratings and evaluations (due by February 15) and the Chair's annual evaluations (due by March 1) will be based on the following criteria:
1. **Teaching.** Evaluation of teaching performance will normally involve an inspection of the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, which may include such items as syllabi and student evaluations (available from the departmental office) and other documentation. Portfolios should be made public for other faculty members in the department. Documentation normally should include the following areas:

A. Courses taught at Texas State University during the period being reviewed.

B. Anonymous student evaluations of teaching effectiveness completed by students enrolled in courses taught during that year. The faculty member may also include evaluations by peers, graduating seniors, and alumni.

C. Development of a new course or significant revision of an existing course, with emphasis on the preparation and use of innovative instructional materials and teaching techniques.

D. Direction of major student projects, honors or masters theses.

E. Meeting with students outside the classroom for purposes of academic advising and consultation.

F. Honors or recognition received for teaching effectiveness.

G. Self-development activities focused on improving teaching effectiveness, including formal study in relevant academic areas, as well as attendance at conferences, short courses, or workshops.

H. Evidence that the faculty member is keeping abreast of current and developing trends in the field. This could include a list of books read, workshops and conferences attended, and/or a short description outlining current and developing trends that pertain to topics covered in the courses taught.

I. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit.

2. **Scholarly Activity.** Scholarly output will be evaluated on its quantity, its quality and its contributions to the discipline. In evaluating the value of a scholarly contribution, impact factors, such as, the prestige of the outlet, citation rates, and general circulation should be considered. To facilitate evaluation, we offer the following general ranking of scholarly activities. The highest rank would include refereed publications in academic journals, books, book chapters, monographs and external grants. The second level would include non-refereed publications in academic journals, books, book chapters and monographs. The third level would include internally funded grants and papers published in conference proceedings. The fourth level would include papers presented at state, regional, national or international professional conventions. The fifth level could include papers accepted
for poster sessions at conventions, grant reports and other unpublished reports. Documentation normally should include the following (in order of importance):

A. Refereed publications (submit copies) in academic journals, books, book chapters, monographs and external grants.

B. Non-refereed publications (submit copies) in academic journals, books, book chapters, monographs and book reviews.

C. Internally funded grants and papers published in conference proceedings.

D. Papers presented at state, regional, national, or international professional conventions.

E. Papers accepted for poster sessions at conventions, grant reports, and other unpublished reports.

F. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit.

G. Scholarly activity for lecturers (beyond efforts to develop one’s self professionally) may qualify them for merit. Examples of scholarly activity that could warrant an “exceeds expectations” rating for lecturers could include, in addition to those listed above, completing professional reviews of textbooks or chapters in textbooks.

3. Service. Psychology faculty members are expected to demonstrate behaviors that serve the department's positive image and are congenial in nature. Documentation of service effectiveness should include the following:

A. Service activities within the department, the college or university. Specify any Chair positions or governance responsibilities.

B. Service activities to academic or professional organizations such as editorial or reviewing responsibilities, leadership responsibilities or committee responsibilities.

C. Community service activities related to the faculty member's expertise.

D. Student advising and/or sponsorship of student organizations.

E. Invited lectures.

F. Other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit.

G. Because of the nature of the position of Lecturer, service expectations are different for Lecturers than they are for tenure-track and tenured faculty. Depending on the nature of the individual Lecturer’s appointment and at the discretion of the Chair, Lecturers are expected to demonstrate “Departmental Citizenship” and support departmental goals. For Lecturers, documentation could include attendance at
departmental meetings, attendance at one graduation annually, and/or service on departmental committees (as appropriate). Examples of service activities that could warrant an “exceeds merit expectations” rating in service could include community service activities related to the faculty member’s professional expertise, student advising and/or sponsorship of student organizations, invited lectures, and other documentation the faculty member wishes to submit.

**Evaluation Period**

PPS. 7.10, Paragraph 9, specified that “faculty will be evaluated for merit purposes on the basis of accomplishments at Texas State during the identified evaluation period.” In most recent years that period has been three years. Merit funds will be divided based on performance over the specified period. Each of the years in the identified period will be weighted equally.

**Recommended Timeline**

1. Chair notifies faculty of the annual evaluation process and reminds them that their Annual Workload Report using the on-line College of Liberal Arts on-line form are due February 1.  
1 December

2. Faculty member submits his or her Annual Workload Report using the on-line College Form and submits additional materials (copies of 2006 publications) to the FRC.  
1 February

4. Departmental FRC submits performance evaluations of faculty to Chair. These evaluations are in the form of recommendations in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. The form rates each faculty member as exceeding, meeting, or not meeting “expectations in each of the three areas.  
15 February

5. Chair reviews faculty dossiers, FRC recommendations, completes his or her evaluations, and meets briefly with faculty members to share the chair’s conclusions.  
1 March
Policy for Summer Teaching Priority  
Approved Oct. 10, 2012

The number of summer courses that can be offered is limited by university funding. Instructor demand for these opportunities can outstrip the number of courses available. The following policy shall guide the department chairperson in making summer teaching assignments with transparency and consistency.

The first priority shall be departmental need for the course(s). The department chairperson will determine which courses are needed most. Typically, these courses will be required to complete Psychology degree requirements. If funding allows, opportunities for elective courses may arise. Elective courses normally will not exceed 25% of the total summer course offerings, and priority for elective courses will be given to those required for minors in Forensic Psychology, Sport Psychology, or required by other majors. In all cases, the department chairperson shall make the final decision as to when and where the course is offered as well as the mode of instruction based on the best interest of the department.

After determining the courses to be covered, assignment of instructors shall proceed according to a formula. The formula is designed to ensure that all Psychology full-time faculty members at the rank of Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor receive an opportunity to be included over a 3-year cycle. Rank is not a factor, and ties are broken by lottery. Instructors must be qualified to teach the course as determined by the department chairperson.

**Formula (Low scores receive priority):**

\[
(# \text{ hours taught in most recent summer} \times 3) + (# \text{ hours taught two summers ago} \times 2) + (# \text{ hours taught three summers ago})
\]

**Example:**

Imagine the department chair has specified 8 required courses and 2 unspecified elective courses to be offered in Session 1. All faculty members who requested to teach in Session 1 are eligible at this point. Two faculty members (Instructors A and B) are tied with a priority score of 0, which indicates the highest overall level of priority. A lottery is won by Instructor A, who picks first and is allowed up to 6 hours worth of courses. Instructor A selects one required 3-hour course and one elective 3-hour course. Instructor B picks second and likewise selects one required course and one elective. The instructor with the next lowest score is then eligible to pick, but this person is not qualified to teach any of the six remaining courses, so the selection goes to the person with the next lowest score. Course selection continues in this manner until all Session 1 courses are assigned. Any faculty member who receives less than 6 hours during Session 1 remains eligible for the balance of hours in Session 2.