

Scholarship Activities of Clinical Psychologists
at the Top 100 Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States

Lauren A. Stutts, Ph.D.

Davidson College

Citation:

Stutts, L. A. (2019). *Scholarship activities of clinical psychologists at the top 100 liberal arts colleges in the United States* [White paper]. Retrieved from <https://cplac.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/scholarship-activities-of-clinical-psychologists-at-liberal-arts-colleges-5.pdf>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Study Abstract	3
2. Participant Information	4
3. Publications Per Year Across All Faculty	5
4. Tenured Faculty Results	6
5. Tenure-Track Faculty Results	18
6. Grants	24
7. Conferences	25
8. Professional Organizations	26

STUDY ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine scholarship activities of clinical psychologists at the top 100 ranked liberal arts colleges in the United States

Method: The survey was sent to clinical psychologists with identifiable contact information ($N = 124$) at the top 100 ranked liberal arts colleges according to the 2019 U.S. News & World Report rankings: <https://www.usnews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-liberal-arts-colleges>. Of those potential participants, 87 were tenured, 33 were tenure-track, and 4 did not have a clear tenure status. I received data from 61 faculty members for an overall response rate of 49.2%. Of these participants, 41 were tenured (response rate: 47.1%) and 20 were tenure-track (response rate: 60.6%). Almost one-third of participants were from the 1-20 ranked schools. Participants answered questions about their scholarship activities and responded to open-ended questions about scholarship norms. They also provided information about grant sources, conferences attended, and professional affiliations. Descriptive statistics are reported for the quantitative data, and the open-ended responses are organized by comment. Comments were unchanged with the exception of the occasional removal of identifying information.

Results: Over the past five years (2014-2018), faculty reported publishing an average of 1.96 ($SD = 1.43$) of peer-reviewed journal articles per year. The average number of total peer-reviewed journal articles when tenured faculty went up for tenure was 15.91 ($SD = 9.68$) with an average of 9.85 ($SD = 7.20$) being published during their tenure-track position. Qualitative responses revealed notable variability and lack of clarity about publication expectations, and an emphasis on quality of publications over quantity. Faculty largely reported that publications that were in press “counted” as publications, whereas publications that were under review did not. In addition, faculty indicated that peer-reviewed publications were given more weight than clinical texts. Being first author was mostly reported to be important as well as publishing independently from previous advisors. Faculty generally indicated that presentations were important, particularly with student co-authors, but presentations were not viewed as important as publications. The most common grants faculty obtained were from the National Institutes of Health and from private foundations. In addition, the top two conferences and professional affiliations were the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies and the American Psychological Association.

Discussion: Due to the relatively low response rate and the higher response rate from faculty at higher-ranked schools, I do not suggest that these data be used for publication norms. It is likely that individuals who are more focused on scholarship completed this survey, thus skewing these results to be higher than they actually are a normative basis. In addition, norms at higher-ranked institutions may be different from norms at lower-ranked institutions, complicating the utility of the data. However, many of the qualitative responses will likely be of use and have important implications for how the process can be improved. For example, it appears that more clarity about publication expectations would be helpful for faculty.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

61 faculty members

Tenure Information

- 41 were tenured (67.2%)
 - o Status
 - 19 were Associate
 - 20 were Full
 - 2 were "Chaired Professors"
 - o Year Earned Tenure
 - 7 \leq 2000
 - 15 between 2001-2010
 - 17 between 2011-2019
 - 2 did not disclose
 - o Gender
 - 21 women
 - 12 men
 - 8 did not disclose
- 20 were tenure-track (32.8%)
 - o Year of tenure-track job
 - 8 were in year 1-3
 - 10 were in year 4-7
 - 2 did not disclose
 - o Gender
 - 12 women
 - 5 men
 - 3 did not disclose

School Information

- School Ranking
 - o 19 ranked 1-20 (31.2%)
 - o 13 ranked 21-50 (21.4%)
 - o 16 ranked 51-100 (26.2%)
 - o 13 did not disclose (21.2%)
- Teaching Load
 - o 10 teach 4 courses/year (16.4%)
 - All of these were in the 1-20 ranked schools
 - o 29 teach 5 courses/year (47.5%)
 - 9 were ranked 1-20
 - 12 were ranked 21-50
 - 7 were ranked 51-100
 - 1 did not disclose
 - o 10 teach 6 courses/year (16.4%)
 - 1 was ranked 11-20
 - 9 were ranked 51-100
 - o 12 missing (19.7%)

PUBLICATIONS BY YEAR ACROSS ALL FACULTY

These results are from 50 faculty (missing 11 participants' data).

Year	<i>M (SD)</i>	Median	Range
2018	2.24 (2.43)	2	0 – 12
2017	1.84 (1.89)	1	0 – 9
2016	1.98 (1.61)	2	0 – 6
2015	2.27 (2.30)	2	0 – 13
2014	1.48 (1.50)	1	0 – 6

Overall average number of publications per year (2014-2018): 1.96 (*SD* = 1.43)

TENURED FACULTY RESULTS

The following data are from only 41 tenured faculty members and skewed toward schools that are higher ranked; therefore, the generalizability is low.

Publications When Faculty Went Up for Tenure

Category	TOTAL		ONLY DURING TENURE-TRACK	
	M/SD	Range	M/SD	Range
Peer-Reviewed Publications	15.91 (9.68)	1 - 38	9.85 (7.20)	1 - 40
Book Chapters	2.65 (3.27)	0 - 15	1.37 (2.17)	0 - 10
Books	0.18 (0.48)	0 - 2	0.17 (0.64)	0 - 3

Category	M/SD	Range
# Student Coauthors on Peer-Reviewed Publications	4.64 (5.80)	0 – 30
# Student Coauthors on Book Chapters	0.35 (1.06)	0 – 5
1 st Author Publications	7.24 (4.81)	0 – 16
2 nd Author Publications	3.77 (3.74)	0 – 14
3 rd Author Publications	2.39 (2.42)	0 – 10
4 th Author Publications	1.18 (1.18)	0 – 4
5 th Author Publications	0.74 (0.99)	0 – 4
6 th Author Publications	0.22 (0.43)	0 – 1
Senior Author Publications	2.21 (3.85)	0 – 12
# Empirical articles	12.67 (9.05)	0 – 38
# Review articles	1.27 (1.89)	0 – 6
# Meta-analyses	0.09 (0.29)	0 – 1
# of Commentaries/editorials	0.38 (0.74)	0 – 3

Recent Publication Information

Category	M/SD	Range
# of articles in 2018	1.61 (1.69)	0 – 5
# of articles in 2017	1.63 (1.74)	0 – 6
# of articles in 2016	1.78 (1.62)	0 – 6
# of articles in 2015	1.91 (1.69)	0 – 6
# of articles in 2014	1.66 (1.66)	0 – 6

What advice have you received about expectations regarding quantity and quality of publications before or after tenure?

- 8-12 publications, most peer reviewed articles, not including before beginning position, many should be first authored
- Before tenure my chair advised that I should have 5 peer reviewed articles published while on the tenure track. I haven't received any advice about how many articles to have since receiving tenure.
- About one/year
- Quality more important than quantity; shoot for one every 1.5 years when going up for tenure; quantity unclear after tenure/for promotion
- Approximately 1-2 articles per year
- 1 publication a year; at least 2 publications prior to coming up for tenure; publication venue or prestige of journal/book doesn't matter; co-authored publications with students are especially valued
- Expectation of 2 per year or 1 that is of particularly good 'quality'
- Average at least one peer-reviewed publication per year
- Be first author on at least 1 paper
- Before tenure, I got unofficial advice that at least "one per year" was a good rate for my department. I definitely know that first author pubs are preferred and that, if the publication has an undergrad student first author, this is almost viewed as a first authored pub as well given the significant mentoring involved. It seemed like it for sure didn't count as much if it wasn't peer reviewed. (Almost got the sense it wouldn't really count much at all.) Honestly, post tenure I haven't gotten any advice. Just "keep doing what you're doing," basically. I wish it was less vague because I would like to pursue promotion to full.
- There was a general rumor that "two by tenure" was good enough---meaning two peer-reviewed publications of work started and finished during the tenure timeline. However, I was unclear how work started elsewhere but finished at our institution (e.g., data collection occurred at postdoc but analysis/papers not complete) would be counted. I haven't heard any expectations about after tenure.
- This has recently changed at my institution. Previously, faculty were hired on the "promise of research productivity", but no explicit requirement was stated regarding publication. In the past two years, the faculty body voted to require "at least 1 peer-reviewed publication" as part of the scholarship requirement for tenure. No statement is made regarding the quality/impact factor of said publication. Amongst my program peers it was generally agreed that I would maintain an active research lab and work hard towards publishing something during my years prior to tenure.
- Before tenure I was advised that if I had a 1st author pub a year in a respectable journal in my discipline (i.e., one that external reviewer would recognize and acknowledge as a respectable), then I would be comfortably above the bar for tenure. Also, at least some of those papers must include undergraduate co-authors. Clarity on promotion from associate to full in terms of research productivity is much more opaque - though I am planning to keep that same pace and go up as soon as possible (that said, I'm taking on riskier - and larger - projects, so I may not keep the pace).

- Only publications with our college's name in the affiliation byline "counted" for tenure. So anything published prior did not count. We must report impact factors for each journal in which we publish so that tenure and promotion committees can assess the quality of the journal. Empirical journal articles are weighed much more than books. Articles about teaching (even if empirically based), like an article in *Teaching of Psychology*, are weighted much less than other articles. About 1-2 peer-reviewed journal articles per year is generally considered good for tenure (first 7 years) and promotion (next 7 years).
- My college values teaching and service over scholarship. and scholarship is defined in various ways other than publications.
- Advice was to stay away from high-risk research and not start on publications that might never see publication due to their complexity. For example, I was going to try to do a meta-analysis (which I'd never done) but a senior colleague warned me not to try something so difficult pre-tenure; he suggested I finish writing up my datasets that were already collected.
- I think a handful of high-quality peer reviewed publications is adequate. We are interested in trajectory more than output--does the person have a trajectory that will work at our institution and that will include students?
- Not much to be honest. I figured that one per year would be sufficient to get tenure, but I always strive to get more.
- What is important is a steady, programmatic line of peer-reviewed published research in good journals. Research in which one is clearly the "owner" or "driver," i.e., not still publishing most work with former advisors. No "expected numbers" are given as different kinds of research take longer, e.g. longitudinal research but clearly more than one a year, or just several right at tenure time.
- This was really vague in our department until recently. Practitioners were held to the same standard as traditional scientists. So, we had to essentially meet two tracks for approval.
- Pre-tenure I was told to focus on quality rather than quantity and to demonstrate independence in my research.
- Prior to tenure, I was told that quality overall was of more value than quantity (though a quantity of 0 or 1 was not ok). In other words, I would be better off publishing one excellent paper in *JPSP* than a couple of small-scale papers. I was not told that I had to publish with students, so I didn't. After receiving tenure, I received no feedback about my publications at all! I think my department had (perhaps misplaced!) confidence that I knew what I was doing.
- Advice pre-tenure was often contradictory. One chair told me that I should publish less because he had convinced our dean that one publication a year in psychology was just about the maximum to expect from Psychology and that my frequency of publication was making others in the dept. "look bad."
- The advice has been mixed and depends on the source. I work at an institution that does not have clear numerical thresholds (unlike some other institutions). When I was hired, the department chair at the time told me that I would need "one or two publications a year in APA journals." After I arrived, I discovered that this threshold was in fact not met by

others who had earned tenure in recent years (and also not since I earned tenure). I produced just over one publication per year before tenure.

- I was told not to talk too much about my research because it would suggest I wasn't committed to being a teacher-scholar. I ignored that advice.
- I was told pre-tenure that it was expected that publications were required for tenure. There wasn't a magic number given.
- Some publications are necessary. They should be in "good" (or better) journals, but do not need to be in top-tier journals. My institution has a heavy teaching load and the research expectations are not extremely high.
- Very little explicit advice. Before tenure - "we want evidence that you are active in your field"; post tenure - "Keep doing what you are doing - you need to show productivity beyond what you did for tenure"
- Given guidance that both are important, but quality is valued over quantity.
- Both quantity and quality matter, but there is no specific desired number required for promotion. Student participation in research is valued.
- Publication is necessary, but not quantified.
- Very little advice re: quantification. Nobody ever gives you a "magic number," but I did hear unofficially that I needed to have at least one pub per year to get tenure (at a minimum). I don't have a good sense about expectations post-tenure.
- None

Did/does your institution value/count articles that were in press/under review/ or in preparation before tenure or after tenure?

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes
- Yes.
- Yes, I believe so.
- Yes, for the in press articles. No for the others.
- Yes, in press. Under review is less impressive, in preparation is barely valued.
- Yes, "in press" would count, but under review not unless you have some external feedback indicating the likelihood of publication/impact (e.g., preliminary comments from reviewers)
- Yes but recently in the past three years with a new Dean of Faculty, in press is not counted, and online is not counted.
- In press, yes. Not Under Review
- They only counted in press articles
- In press counted for tenure, but I don't know how they will count papers that were under review and were subsequently published after tenure.
- Only in press
- In press articles count toward tenure review. Under review articles are seen as scholarly activity not scholarly achievement.

- In press, yes definitely. Under review were probably counted more as in preparation. I don't know that manuscripts "in preparation" counted as anything (and personally, I don't think that they should).
- I believe that they are valued as indicators of a candidate's trajectory of productivity, but perhaps not weighted as heavily as work completed during the pre-tenure period.
- Manuscripts accepted for publication / in press articles count the same as published articles. Manuscripts under review generally do not count because the quality of the work can't be assessed by review committees.
- In press MIGHT be considered, but only with a letter from the editor of the journal vouching for you. In terms of in preparation, no. But, for the "under review" category, this might help you, if you had no publications, but for some reason they still really wanted to tenure you (odd but it happens) -- in these cases, the people who received tenure despite not having actual peer-reviewed published research did have multiple articles under review or in the pipeline. I think if you have only one article, with NONE others in a pipeline or under review, you still might not get tenure, if they for some reason did NOT want to tenure you. Not sure if this is clear.
- Interestingly, this was an issue for me. I had a paper under review upon arrival that published the year after, and another under review at the time of my tenure. In both cases, the tenure committee informed me that they considered these as counting towards (what was at that time) the unofficial publication requirement. However, I was informed by the dean during my mid-probationary review that my under review manuscript at the time of my hiring did not count. At that point it was clear that there was not a consensus amongst the different bodies governing tenure regarding what does/doesn't count.
- It's not clear. I think that in-press would count but not others.
- My institution counts papers that are in press before and after tenure, but not papers under review or in preparation.
- In press counts; under review may receive some mention; in preparation typically doesn't.
- In press definitely counts (no different than published)
under review or in preparation don't count for much UNLESS there is an external review of them (outside reviews have to follow rather strict procedural rules)
- Articles that are in press are valued. Those under review show evidence of continued scholarship but are not valued as much, especially in the absence of articles in print (or in press). This applies to the period of time both before and after tenure. One consideration: If a tenure candidate has no publications in print but some in press, that is better than not having any publications at all, but to the extent that the timeline could indicate a "race at the end toward tenure," it is not ideal. What they want to see is (a) sustained scholarship throughout the tenure-track years that is (b) independent of one's graduate/postdoctoral mentors.
- For tenure, accepted/in-press seems to count just the same as an already published work. Under review is good, but doesn't really count as much--although invited revision is good. For the purposes of our annual review, things don't "count" until they're published (at least online first) but for promotion, I think they do so long as they're accepted.

- Currently, we acknowledge that attempts to publish and publications in press count when under review (post-tenure). We needed pubs pre-tenure.
- Unless it is published, it doesn't really count. We can use under review or in press to support our claims that we've been productive, but it doesn't technically count towards a publication.
- I had one in press which I think they considered the same as a publication. I had one under review that they probably did not count. I didn't submit anything in preparation---my sense was that it didn't count for anything.
- In press counts as published. Under review is pretty good, but not as good as in press. In prep doesn't count for much.
- No
- No
- Count toward what?

Are peer-reviewed publications valued differently compared to other clinical texts such as books, treatment manuals, etc by your institution?

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, peer-reviewed is at the top of the hierarchy, non-peer-reviewed is next in line
- Yes, peer reviewed publications are the most highly valued.
- Yes, peer reviewed publications are valued much higher
- Yes, peer-reviewed paper (especially empirical ones) are the currency. You must have evidence of the ability to publish in a peer-reviewed journals with undergrads.
- Yes, all empirical studies published in peer-reviewed journals count more than books and book chapters. I published a textbook that is widely used and was not valued as much as journal articles. Non-peer-reviewed materials, like treatment manuals, would probably not be valued by college since other faculty will not know what this is.
- Yes, very much so
- Yes; books, treatment manuals, etc., I would imagine would NOT count at all if one had NO publications of empirical work.
- Yes, peer reviewed articles given more weight
- Yes. We are trying to change this, but at the moment, peer-reviewed pubs are the gold standard.
- Yes peer-reviewed publications are valued the most much less than book chapters. Also, peer-reviewed articles with research I collected myself are valued more than data somebody else collected
- Yes, peer-reviewed publications are valued more.
- Yes, given more weight
- Yes - Peer-reviewed publications are the top (at department level)
- Mainly peer-reviewed pubs are valued. Other possibilities haven't come up for me, however.

- At the department level, yes, peer-reviewed publications count more. I'm not sure how the College-level committee, dean, and president value these various forms of publication.
- I would assume, based on other colleagues who have published outside of the empirical literature, that as long as the work is "peer-reviewed" and/or undergoes a secondary editorial process then it counts. For example, I have heard a faculty person encouraged to seek a publisher rather than self-publish a textbook.
- I assume so, but it's not made clear.
- Probably. Most people in our department do not do clinical work (there are only two of us) so I think it would take a lot of educating about the relative value of a treatment manual.
- No.
- No
- No
- No difference
- I cannot really comment, as I do not have any publications in the latter type. My guess is that the latter type would still be valued but should not replace empirical publications entirely.
- Not really, though it would be up to the candidate (i.e., me) to convince/contextualize the significance of the clinical texts to the promotion/tenure committee (as the committee members come from all disciplines on campus).
- Not necessarily, but it depends on the nature of the publication. Blog posts or self-published materials would be different than books or manuals with a major publisher.
- This issue has never come up as I am the first clinical psychologist hired by the institution and my scholarship has only taken the form of peer-reviewed empirical papers. However, I believe that such texts would be valued but not considered to be sufficient scholarship for tenure.
- I'm not sure. My impression is that peer-reviewed pubs would be ranked higher, but clinical texts would also count as "scholarly activity" (perhaps similar to grant apps that went unfunded)?
- I don't know, as I have only published articles.
- People publish books so rarely in psychology that I don't know what view my institution has of them for psychologists.
- It's hard to say because not many people in my department do this kind of work. I'm working on a treatment manual now so we'll see how that goes.
- Unknown

How does your institution value author-order for you and your student co-authors (e.g., wants you to be first author, wants students to be first author)?

- Wants me to be first author unless clear that student is driving the project and deserves to be first author
- I was explicitly advised that a student first-author pub "counts" as a first-author pub for the faculty member. I don't know if our tenure and promotion committees always treat it that way (though I would strongly advocate that they should).
- For tenure and promotion, it's important for the faculty to be first or second author. It's also important for tenure to work independently and NOT have your faculty or postdoc advisors on papers with you. My college likes to have students on my papers and co-authors, but I don't know if that makes a difference in tenure and promotion decisions.
- There is some emphasis on having a significant percentage of first-authored articles and student co-authors
- Wants me to be first author unless it is a student
- It depends, for independent studies and honors research students should be first authors. I should be first author on papers where students are research assistants.
- Doesn't care about student authorship--told not to include students until after tenure
- I think pre-tenure faculty tend to be first authors. Post-tenure faculty are more generous about sharing authorship. I have quite a few student first-authored publications, but I am senior.
- There is no guidance (value) around the order students assume on publications - it is up to the faculty member. Including students is valued highly.
- Student co-authorship is valued. A first author student paper is great, but they understand that that's very hard to come by. First authorship is valued, and I'm trying to educate my department on the value of senior authorship in my field.
- Being first author is given more weight.
- My institution seems to value having faculty be any author on a publication, although it is important for at least some publications to be first-authored at tenure and at promotion in order to ensure that the faculty member is a leader on the publication.
- If the work is mine I think they want me to be first author to reflect this.
- I think it is recognized that most student work is the product of very labor-intensive mentorship, and most students' path to publication involves working on a project with a faculty member, so there has been little question that a faculty member is typically first author.
- In a ridiculous fashion -- I allowed my student to be first author b/c it would help him in his career more than I needed it
- They don't have strict guidelines but I wouldn't have expected to get tenure without at least one first-authored paper. I wouldn't give a student first authorship given that most students cannot really earn it.
- The institutions position is similar to APA ethics guidelines that authorship follows from level of work involved in the production of the piece. They also recognize that not all disciplines lend themselves to including students in the research/publication process, and therefore while student publications are encouraged where possible, they are certainly not

- a requirement. The institution also recognizes different conventions for author order across disciplines. (eg. senior-author-last vs. senior-author-first)
- Hasn't been communicated. I try to give students first/higher author whenever possible.
 - First-authored publications are important but the first author should be assigned fairly based on the primary designer of the work. It is good if students are on publications or presentations with us, if they earn it
 - First-author is preferred but other involvement is appreciated.
 - They never gave me an opinion on this. I always put myself as first author because I did the primary load of work to turn research into publications. I don't think it would have counted less if my student had been the first author
 - My sense is that authorship decisions are made by each faculty member, that these decisions vary quite a bit from person to person, and that the department/institution understands this. The model I have adopted is that student authorship on a publication has a high threshold, but student authorship on conference presentations (e.g., posters) has a much lower threshold.
 - It's not clear so I have simply used my own judgment regarding the student's role and contribution. The student first authored pubs that I'm co-author on were either based on their honors thesis or on a project where they were on fellowship and collaborated on every part of the project, then took the lead on writing it up. (Basically, what first author should be!) As mentioned above, I've been told that student first author pubs are implicitly my first authored pubs in the eyes of my colleagues.
 - Author order doesn't matter. It's nice to have student co-authors, but not required.
 - Not sure - I honestly don't care. People should spend less time worrying about this question and far more time being productive...the rest will work itself out.
 - No preference.
 - Either is fine
 - There is not an explicit preference.
 - I'm not sure there's an institutional norm here.
 - Doesn't matter
 - Unknown
 - N/A
 - No explicit preference.

What national conference presentation/student presentation expectations have been advised?

- At least one presentation annually.
- Conference attendance and including students on conference presentations is highly encouraged.
- Seen as desirable
- We are expected to "regularly" engage in scholarly activity with students. Typically, our department expects faculty to present at national or regional conferences (with student coauthors) most, if not all, years. I have been at the institution for XX years and have presented at national conferences XX (all but two) of those years (XX (all but two) of those

years with student coauthors). Institutional support for conference travel (up to \$2,000 per conference/year) is available ONLY if one is presenting research.

- Faculty should be presenting regularly at national or regional (peer-reviewed) conferences.
- We should go to national conferences once per year
- Student conference presentations are encouraged
- Our department has set internal goals regarding student presentations in undergraduate and professional research contexts, but there is no specific tenure-related advice about this.
- Conferences count as "scholarly activity" (not "scholarly achievement," which is a higher category) for the faculty member. It is up to us whether or not to take students along. But the department does value (and notes that in review letters) if we are able to involve student authors at conferences.
- Presentations count, but are third in the hierarchy (behind peer-reviewed pubs and then non-peer-reviewed pubs)
- Presentations are seen as scholarly activity not scholarly achievement. They are valued but much less so than peer-reviewed articles.
- These are seen as important as a means of staying active and making connections with other researchers, but they don't "count" the way that publications do.
- Our department faculty typically bring students with them for presentations at national and international conferences. Students often co-author posters.
- Just to be active in attending conferences, with \$550 to attend any conference, and complete expenses paid for any conference at which a professor presents. In practice, professors often receive reimbursement to present papers at up to 3 conferences.
- I should have some students going to conferences ideally, but these won't count for anything if I don't have peer-reviewed papers. However, I couldn't imagine not having students presenting at conferences with me. That's where all the fun happens! Makes lots of other things worth putting up with.
- None for students, but I've had over 30 students present at national conferences
- I was advised to attend conferences regularly in order to disseminate my work and build a name in my field.
- It's good to take students to conferences and co-present with them. No specific expectations - that's just the norm in my department so I've done this frequently.
- Nothing explicit, but that being visible in the field (in the way that you are at major conferences) is very helpful to external letter writers in terms of being able to make the case for your contributions.
- Nothing explicit or numerical. Rather, the expectation is that faculty members "remain active" in scholarship generally. Conference presentations are expected but do not replace publications. Student presentations (including at internal events) are expected, not necessarily annually, but "regularly."
- Our expectations are about being research-active, so conference presentations are good (but not required).
- In general, there doesn't seem to be much emphasis on conference presentations. Publications are weighted much, much more heavily.

- There is currently no official statement regarding conference presentations. In my own program we generally expect that members will present at least once per year w/ w/o students. We also have an annual budget for personal conference travel and a mechanism to partially support students, so the expectation is that we are actively using those funds.
- None. I usually take 2-3 students to 2-3 conferences (national and international) each year. Students typically do posters and I typically give talks.
- None specifically...it is looked upon favorably if students' work is of the caliber that can be presented at conferences
- It's unclear. On the one hand, they ask us to list all conference presentations and highlight work done with students, but on the other hand, I got the sense that it would be "a nice bonus" but not enough to stand up as scholarship on its own.
- None explicitly. Again, don't worry about this. Focus on networking, and conference engagement will be a part of that
- No number specified
- None. It is based more upon publication.
- They haven't
- None

What other advice have you been given about publication norms in your department/institution/etc?

- Shoot for one every 1.5 years when going up for tenure
- 2 per year
- At tenure decision time, at least one publication should represent work begun since starting at the institution
- Publishing one piece a year is a reasonable goal. Including students is ideal.
- To maintain an active research program but that there are not set standards for numbers of articles that are expected.
- answered above (1 first author pub a year on average is above the bar, must publish at least sometimes with undergrads)
- Clinical psychologists are evaluated the same way as other science faculty at my college. This is sometimes tricky, because it takes a long time to do clinical research at liberal arts college. Sometimes, other science faculty don't understand this.
- It's the coin of the realm, so it's worth taking the time to do. I think the college is less interested in the numbers related to productivity and more interested in ascertaining whether junior faculty can balance a very engaged teaching and service schedule (typical of the liberal arts) with an active research program. This is a fundamentally different environment compared to an R1, and while a PhD and graduate publication record is a good indicator of productivity there, it is important to see that liberal arts faculty can situate themselves such that they can both provide excellent academic instruction and be an active/productive scholar.
- We developed two tracks for retention and promotion, a scientist track and a scientist-practitioner track. This better allows for a balance of appreciated activity. For example, obtaining licensure and presenting an empirical poster at a national convention is roughly

equal to a first-authored peer-reviewed publication. It is expected that any clinical work directly contributes to the quality of teaching related courses.

- In general, my institution recognizes that the nature of publications may change post-tenure to include more secondary author publications, more chapters, and more variety of types of publications.
- Publications are reviewed for content only at tenure & promotion. More senior faculty write a letter that evaluates the strengths and limitations of particular articles and of the portfolio as a whole.
- Publication norms vary by discipline and even subdiscipline. Even within a department, there is a wide range of quality/quantity of publications leading up to tenure. Although impact factor (albeit an imperfect measure of journal quality) is referenced when evaluating tenure dossiers, it does not carry as much weight as it might at other places.
- Collaboration is great, but make sure you're not only collaborating with your grad school advisor and/or only a later co-author on stuff with collaborators from grad school or post doc. You should be lead on some publications, even if they are based on pre-existing collaborations.
- We are a small institution and expectations vary widely across departments. In our department, there is an expectation to try and publish regularly, but there are no explicit norms.
- The senior colleagues in the department should provide context for the college evaluation committee, which consists of colleagues outside of the discipline. There is a need for senior colleagues to clarify the nature or impact of the junior colleague's work (e.g., longitudinal work, impact of publications).
- I had some issues with people in my department preferring that work be published in psychology journals, but my work was with [specific field], so I published in some [specific medical] journals because it felt like the right place to reach those making decisions and referrals. I had to clarify my publication preferences in my tenure statement.
- Informally, I was told that our department is very productive in terms of publication. But within the institution there has been great emphasis placed on not quantifying the number of publications necessary for tenure (although it is quite clear that some type of publication is necessary).
- There was very little explicit statement about the number of publications that I would need or what would be expected of me.
- Nothing else. I had to seek out the expectations from a productive colleague early on in my career. Most of my senior colleagues (none of whom are in clinical) are NOT very productive with their scholarship.
- Nothing, and there is a lot of variability among faculty.
- Very, very little. I just try to do good work.
- Stay current in statistical methods.
- None
- None
- None
- None

TENURE-TRACK FACULTY RESULTS

The following data are from only 20 tenure-track faculty members and skewed toward schools that are higher ranked; therefore, the generalizability is low. Also, these tables do not take tenure year into consideration due to the small sample size.

Category	Total Thus Far		Only During Tenure-Track	
	<i>M/SD</i>	Range	<i>M/SD</i>	Range
Peer-Reviewed Publications	21.06 (10.07)	7 – 40	9.53 (8.73)	0 – 40
Book Chapters	3.29 (3.18)	0 – 11	1.25 (1.29)	0 – 4
Books	0.13 (0.34)	0 – 1	0.19 (0.54)	0 – 2

Category	<i>M/SD</i>	Range
# Student Coauthors on Peer-Reviewed Publications	3.42 (4.18)	0 – 16
# Student Coauthors on Book Chapters	0.35 (0.86)	0 – 3
1 st Author Publications	10.82 (8.26)	1 – 36
2 nd Author Publications	5.12 (4.09)	0 – 13
3 rd Author Publications	3.0 (1.75)	0 – 7
4 th Author Publications	1.76 (1.71)	0 – 7
5 th Author Publications	1.21 (1.81)	0 – 6
6 th Author Publications	0.55 (0.82)	0 – 2
Senior Author Publications	0.67 (0.87)	0 – 2
# Empirical articles	18.35 (10.30)	5 – 40
# Review articles	2.06 (2.11)	0 – 6
# Meta-analyses	0.67 (1.11)	0 – 4
# of Commentaries/editorials	0.43 (0.76)	0 – 2

Recent Publication Information

Category	<i>M/SD</i>	Range
# of articles in 2018	3.47 (3.14)	0 – 12
# of articles in 2017	2.24 (2.17)	0 – 9
# of articles in 2016	2.35 (1.58)	0 – 5
# of articles in 2015	3.00 (3.14)	0 – 13
# of articles in 2014	1.13 (1.09)	0 – 4

What advice have you received about expectations regarding quantity and quality of publications for tenure?

- 3-5 by some people and 5-8 peer review publications depending on who you ask. In my department there is also greater value placed on publications in mainstream psychology journals as opposed to [specific] journals which is a problem for me because that is the type of psychology I do.
- 2-3 pubs/year in respected journals, need to demonstrate independence (which I think is challenging in clinical research which often depends on team science to access clinical samples and long data collection periods for longitudinal and applied research), student involvement and authorship valued.
- Aim for 1-2 publications per year, at least one publication in a high-quality journal, at least one publication with a student co-author from current institution.
- I should publish 1-2 empirical or review/theory articles a year, without specific preference for journal
- I was advised to have about 2 publications per year.
- 1+ peer-reviewed article per year is fine. Journals should have an impact factor, be peer-reviewed.
- 1 per year
- To publish one peer-reviewed article a year
- My institution has been intentionally vague. A number of required or recommended publications for tenure is not specified in our handbook, and it was communicated that this was done for legal reasons. Some faculty have recommended publishing at least 1 article per year whereas others have suggested that I adhere to standards at research 1 institutions to be "safe."
- Quality matters more than quantity, expect that my productivity will decline (i.e., from my last position at an R1), aim to just teach during the semesters & only focus on research during the winter & summer breaks
- At XXXX, the emphasis is on quality, not quantity. I have been told (and what I have seen) is that the college takes a holistic approach to evaluating each candidate so - for better and for worse - there is no clear metric or algorithm or even advice for, say, how many pubs would merit tenure.
- Nobody will give advice about quantity and nobody will commit to specific operationalizations of quality.
- I have received very little advice and it has often been conflicting. I have heard ~1 pub a year. I have heard that it is important for me to publish on data I have collected since coming to my institution. And I have heard that it is important to have student co-authors. But, I have also been told that these things don't matter so much as long as I am doing "good" work.
- They have said that quality counts more than quantity, but I find that isn't a good way to consider things in clinical psychology. highest quality articles in clinical psychology employ large clinical samples or are longitudinal in nature, which is really not feasible at a liberal arts college without any graduate students. so, I have aimed for high quality but overall low impact studies to contribute to the literature.

- Bar is quite low (I'd guess 2 peer-reviewed articles would be good), but I can't get anyone to put a number on it. Quality of journal not particularly important from what I gather.
- Very little. I am very interested in your results. I often look at the CVs of people in similar positions to get some guidance.
- None.

Does your institution value/count articles that are in press/under review/ or in preparation for tenure?

- Yes, I believe so.
- Only in-press and probably under review.
- Yes
- Yes. In press counts the same. Under review counts (but less). In preparation counts little.
- Yes. It is seen as positive, but not sufficient by itself.
- In press and under review, yes. in prep, no.
- Yes, my institution values all of them.
- In press counts as a publication. Under review or in progress shows movement but does not count for tenure.
- They take it into consideration but it isn't a focus of the portfolio.
- My institution will not be pinned down on what counts and what doesn't, but my informal sense is that these are considered along with everything else.
- I believe so.
- Not sure, but I think so.
- I think so, but am unclear
- No
- Unclear.
- I have no idea, but I kind of doubt it
- Good question. I don't know what consideration can be given to those when you actually come up.

Are peer-reviewed journal articles valued differently compared to other types of publications (e.g., books, treatment manuals) by your institution?

- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, peer reviewed valued more.
- Yes. They are valued more.
- Yes, peer-reviewed journal articles would be counted most highly.
- Peer/reviewed journal articles are definitely top (with empirical trumping theory/review papers). Then book chapters, etc.
- Yes - they are more valued
- Yes, they are preferred (or such is my impression)
- Peer-reviewed articles are valued above books/treatment manuals, etc.
- Yes. Peer-reviewed articles are preferred.

- Yes. Peer reviewed articles are the primary currency. Other publications are secondary at best.
- Yes- peer reviewed journal articles are most important in psych (other fields not)
- Peer-reviewed journal articles are valued most. As I noted above, beyond that, there is also greater value placed on publications in mainstream psychology journals as opposed to ethnic/culturally focused journals which is a problem for me because that is the type of psychology I do.
- I believe valued more highly than book chapters, books, etc.
- Yes, I would say probably peer-reviewed articles are valued more by my department - not by my institution as a whole, necessarily. (For example, publishing a book is important in History, Political Science, etc., here.)
- My sense is that they likely are valued differently, but nobody will commit to an effort to quantify relative value/weight.
- I am not sure.

How does your institution value author-order for you and your student co-authors (e.g., wants you to be first author, wants students to be first author)?

- First author is most valued; student as first author would be acceptable
- They primarily want me to be first author.
- Wants & expects that we'd be first-author.
- First author is best, but being senior author with a student as lead author is also very highly regarded.
- More important that students are included, regardless of the order
- I haven't received a clear answer about this, but informally it seems that being first author is good especially pre-tenure. Involving students at an authorship level is great, but doesn't seem to trump being first author from what I can tell.
- My institution cares about having student authors but does not have a standard of order of authorship.
- It seems to me that they are okay with the author order as long as it reflects that actual work conducted.
- I do not believe that this is too much of a concern. Even when students are the first author, other faculty know that tremendous guidance was likely necessary.
- They do not appear to care so long as I do publish with students
- I don't think my institution cares as long as I'm following authorship guidelines in the field. I've felt no pressure either way, but I'm sure I would be supported early in my career getting as many of my own first-authored pubs as possible.
- I don't think they care.
- I haven't gotten any feedback on this, but I know they want us to be more independent vs. collaborative (which also isn't a good fit for clinical psychology in my opinion)
- I don't know. I do know that I was told that I am not expected to publish with students.
- not sure, values their authorship in general.
- Have not received any information from senior faculty regarding this.
- Unclear. No guidelines provided.

What national conference presentation/student presentation expectations have been advised?

- Talks matter more than posters for faculty, try to have students as co-authors on posters, try to have students present at regional or local student conferences.
- It is very good for a tenure case to show that you've taken students (especially our senior thesis students and research assistants) to conferences where they have presented posters or even given a talk. I take my senior thesis students every year.
- Encouraged to actively present with student co-authors.
- It is expected to present posters/symposia at conference, but most importantly, to have student co-authors on poster presentations at national conferences.
- If possible, presenting with students is preferred
- We are encouraged to promote student attendance and presentations at national conferences.
- Students attend mostly regional conferences such as Eastern Psychological Association. That said, students often attend national and international conferences that align with the work they are doing with their advisor.
- Few expectations expressed. But I get students to conferences frequently.
- Nothing quantifiable, but it is encouraged and expected.
- Nothing specific, other than 'try to present with students'
- Vague. "Go to conferences."
- None. Just to do it.
- None stated
- Unclear. No guidelines provided.
- I have received no specific guidance in this area
- N/A

What other advice have you been given about publication norms in your department/institution/etc?

- I was told informally (but it tracks with what I've heard from others) that my institution is looking for three separate "wheels" to be turning when you come up for tenure, but that they don't have to be "turning together" until you go up for full. The wheels are: 1) You're publishing something. 2) You're doing research/scholarship HERE at this institution. 3) You're engaging our students in research/scholarship. So, collecting data here with students but publishing stuff that's still coming out of postdoc, for example, should be fine for tenure from what I understand. By the time you go up for full, they expect you to be publishing work done at the institution with student co-authors.
- I have received conflicting information about publication norms and this information is not widely shared. Meaning, faculty in my department don't share how much they publish so it's hard to measure myself against my peers. The one thing I was told was that every faculty member in my department had a grant, so it was clear that that was important for me.
- We are located in a rural area with a small surrounding population which can make data collection difficult if you are interested in a non-college student sample. As such, I was advised to consider complementing original data collection with data drawn from existing

publicly available data bases. This approach will show productivity in my area while also demonstrating active collection of original data. This is a good option as long as it is clear that the research question is driving the research.

- Our department & institution understands that norms vary by field & takes input from faculty on what's most valued.
- As I alluded to before, we get fairly vague advice that has to do with quality over quantity.
- Very little discussion of institutional/departmental norms. Encouraged to look at most recently tenured colleagues in department for benchmarking.
- That journal impact factor is not measured or considered very seriously.
- try to get into high impact journals
- Very little. Basically "do what makes you feel like you are fulfilled and doing well, and you are probably past the bar."
- None
- None

GRANTS

These data are from all faculty in the sample. These only include external grants. The number in parentheses represents the number of grants participants secured in each category if it was more than one.

Federal Grants

- NIH
 - o (4) NIH R15 AREA
 - o (3) NIMH R01
 - o NIMH R03
 - o NIMH Small Grant
 - o NIH NIDA R21
 - o NIH SBIR
 - o (2) NIH-other
- NSF
 - o NSF-RUI
 - o NSF-Industrial Innovation and Partnerships
 - o (2) NSF-other
- Environmental Protection Agency

Private Foundation/Association Grants

- (4) Associated Colleges of the South
- (3) Mellon Foundation
- Associated Colleges of the Midwest
- American Psychological Association
 - o (2) Society for Teaching of Psychology
- American Psychological Foundation
- Association for Academic and University Women
- Templeton Foundation
- Teagle Foundation
- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Henry Luce Foundation
- Ford Foundation
- Alliance Healthcare Foundation
- The Duke Endowment
- International OCD Foundation
- Tourette Association of America
- American Heart Association
- USDA nutrition
- National Center for Responsible Gaming

CONFERENCES

These data are from all faculty in the sample. The number in parentheses represents the number of individuals attending each conference regularly if there was more than one.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (21) Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies - (14) American Psychological Association - (6) Association for Psychological Science - (3) Society of Personality and Social Psychology - (2) Society for Research on Child Development - (3) Midwestern Psychological Association - (3) Western Psychological Association - (3) International OCD Foundation - (2) Association for Research in Personality - (2) International Conference on Eating Disorders - (2) Association for Women in Psychology - Southeastern Psychological Association - Eastern Psychological Association - Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood - Collaborative Perspectives on Addiction - Society for Prevention Research and Society for Community Research and Action - Anxiety and Depression Association of America - World Congress of Cognitive Therapy - Sleep Research Society - Psychotherapy Networker's Conference - American Psychology Law Society - Society of Behavioral Medicine - International Convention of Psychological Science - Society for Research in Psychopathology - North American Society for the Study of Personality Disorders - International Society for Systems Science - International Society for Psychotherapy Research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North American Society for Psychotherapy Research - Teacher's College Winter Roundtable - Association of Black Psychologists - International Society for Research in Child and Adolescent Psychopathology - International Society for Research on Internet Interventions - Society for Ambulatory Assessment - Asian American Psychological Association - Society for Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology - Cheiron: The International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences - American Professional Society of ADHD and Related Disorders - Research Society on Alcoholism - College on Problems of Drug Dependence - Child Abuse Summit - American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children - International Conference on Violence against Women and Children - Association for Behavior Analysis International - National Latinx Psychological Association - Perinatal Mental Health Society - Society for Research in Child Development - Society for Adolescent Research - International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies - Eating Disorders Research Society
--	---

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

These data are from all faculty in the sample. This list does not include state or county associations. The number in parentheses represents the number of individuals belonging to each organization if there was more than one.

- (22) Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies	- Society for Research in Psychopathology
- (24) American Psychological Association	- North American Society for the Study of Personality Disorders ISSS
- (11) Association for Psychological Science	- International Society for Research in Child and Adolescent Psychopathology
- (4) Society for a Science of Clinical Psychology	- Asian American Psych Assoc.
- (3) Anxiety and Depression Association of America	- Behavior Genetics Association
- (2) Society for Personality and Social Psychology	- Institute for Security, Technology and Society
- (3) Association for Research in Personality	- American Association of University Professors
- (2) International OCD Foundation	- International Society for Theoretical Psychology
- (2) Society for Research in Child Development	- Society for Psychotherapy Research
- (2) Academy for Eating Disorders	- Society for the Exploration of Psychotherapy Integration
- Society for the Study of Emerging Adulthood	- College on Problems of Drug Dependence
- Society for Prevention Research and Society for Community Research and Action	- American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children
- Midwestern Psychological Association	- Association for Behavior Analysis International
- Western Psychological Association	- Association for Academic and University Women
- Southeastern Psychological Association	- Council on Undergraduate Research
- Association for Higher Education and Disability	- Eastern Psychological Association
- Sleep Research Society	- National Latinx Psychological Association
- American Psychology-Law Society	- Network for Multicultural Training Professionals
- American Board of Professional Psychology	- Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity and Race
- American Board of Forensic Psychology	- New England Psychological Association
- Society for Behavioral Medicine	- Marce Society (postpartum depression)
- New England Psychological Association	- International Academy of Sex Research
- Eastern Psychological Association	- Association for Contextual Behavioral Science
- Association for Contemplative Mind in Higher Education	
- Society for Personality/Social Psychology	