

# **Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Department of Geology**

**Approved by the Department of Geology**

**March 31, 2015**

## Promotion/Tenure Criteria Department of Geology

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Geology Department will carefully follow and adhere to the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's *Guidelines*. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this PTU document and the University *Guidelines*. If an inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's *Guidelines* will supersede this document.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Geology, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

**Advisement:** At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document and the most recent version of the University *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*, and will be advised in writing about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure. He or she will sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

For each assistant professor, the head will appoint a senior faculty mentor who will advise on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion and tenure. If the assistant professor is not satisfied with the mentor, he or she may request that the mentor be replaced and the head will appoint a new mentor.

**Annual evaluation:** Every tenure-stream faculty member will receive a written evaluation from the department head on an annual basis. At the end of each calendar year, the department head will solicit from each faculty member a report of their professional activities in instruction, research, and service covering the twelve-month period that concludes on December 31. The department head will evaluate performance of a faculty member relative to the standards for their rank, expressed below in the section *Criteria for the Ranks*. For assistant and associate professors, the review will provide an assessment of their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Each faculty member will be afforded the opportunity to meet individually with the department head to discuss the written review, during which they may propose changes or additions to the document. The document will be signed by both the faculty member and department head. Performance reviews are generally concluded by the end of February each year.

**Third-year review:** In the spring of the third year each assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in the *Guidelines*. It is recommended that the CV provided for the third-year review be in the promotion dossier format as described in the Administrative Guidelines of the Provost's website [http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/admin\\_guidelines](http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/admin_guidelines). The department head or an assigned faculty mentor will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

At the same time, the department head in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a committee of three faculty to review the faculty member's dossier and performance. For assistant professors, the mentor will serve as a member of this committee. This committee will review research publications and efforts to acquire outside funding, visit several classes, read through teaching evaluations and other evidence of performance in instruction. On the basis of this review, the committee will write a report that presents in detail its finding and that makes clear recommendations to the candidate concerning his or her progress towards promotion. In particular the report will address the question of whether the candidate is progressing in a satisfactory way towards meeting departmental criteria for promotion and tenure. A copy of the report will be given to both the candidate and the department head.

At a regular departmental meeting with a quorum of eligible faculty present, the head will present the report to the faculty. (The Guidelines define faculty eligibility). The faculty will then discuss and vote on the following questions:

“[Candidate's name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor.”

“[Candidate's name] should be renewed for the fourth year.”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on these questions.

The committee conducting the third-year review will provide a copy of the review report to the department head and the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the review, and this response will be made available at the faculty meeting at which votes on the report and renewal of the candidate are taken.

The department head will provide the candidate with a written report of the departmental vote.

**Preliminary Consideration:** The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in section VI C of the *Guidelines*. In the spring of the appropriate year, by the deadline of March 1, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will communicate this wish in writing to the department head.

The candidate will by the March 1 deadline present a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in Appendix C of the *Guidelines*, plus copies of all publications and other supporting documentation to the department head. Faculty eligible to vote on this candidate will review these materials. At a meeting of eligible faculty held by April 15, the faculty will vote on the following question:

“[Candidate’s name] should be formally reviewed for promotion to the [next rank] and/or for tenure.”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. The results will be conveyed by the head in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, candidates who receive a majority of “Yes” votes on this question and who wish to be formally reviewed for promotion and/or tenure will work with the department head or an appointed senior mentor to prepare the dossier.

**Formal Review:** In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the *Guidelines*. In addition, the candidate will make available by August 1 a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in Appendix C of the *Guidelines*, plus copies of all publications as well as teaching materials, including student evaluations, syllabi, and other evidence pertaining to teaching. Student letters may be submitted if solicited by the department head from a list made available by the candidate. All evaluations for all courses taught must be submitted to the head. Articles or books that have been accepted but not published may be submitted if accompanied by a letter of formal acceptance. Unaccepted books or articles may not be submitted or included on the vita. Copies of all published items listed on the vita, along with other materials prepared for the dossier, including the external letters of assessment, must be made available to the department by August 1.

The faculty will meet by or on September 1 to discuss the credentials and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote on each candidate the head will announce how he/she voted.

Requests for reconsideration by candidates who do not receive a positive recommendation must be handled in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

### **Criteria for the Ranks:**

#### **For Tenure and for Promotion to Associate Professor:**

For tenure and for promotion to associate professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.

**Teaching:** On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the candidate must show clear excellence as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in limited direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students.

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

**Research:** In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for tenure and promotion has typically:

- (a) published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of her/his independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;
- (b) demonstrated the ability to obtain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of her/his independent research program. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the candidate is the Principal or co-Principal Investigator.

Successful candidates will generally have a record that approximates or exceeds these departmental expectations. In rare cases, should the candidate fall *significantly* short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for tenure and promotion. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of excellence of the candidate's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the candidate's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

If the department hires a faculty member whose research will result in different kinds of research productivity that are not included above, the department and the candidate must agree in writing at the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement.

**Service:** Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or for tenure are expected to attend departmental meetings, have some limited service on student and departmental committees, and, if asked to serve, limited service on campus committees and governing bodies. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Participation or leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

#### **For Promotion to Professor:**

For promotion to full professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

**Teaching:** On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the candidate must show clear excellence as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students.

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

**Research:** In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for tenure and promotion has typically:

- (a) published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year for a period of at least four years immediately prior to consideration, in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of her/his independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;
- (b) demonstrated the ability to maintain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of

her/his independent research program prior to consideration. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the candidate is the Principal or co-Principal Investigator.

Successful candidates will generally have a record that approximates or exceeds these departmental expectations. In rare cases, should the candidate fall *significantly* short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for tenure and promotion. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of excellence of the candidate's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the candidate's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

**Service:** Successful candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.