

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

Department of Marine Sciences

DRAFT: 14 October 2004

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Marine Sciences will carefully follow and adhere to the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*. The guidelines and criteria that follow provide specific information on how promotion and tenure will be handled in our department, and on the criteria approved by our faculty for promotion and for tenure in the department. Issues not addressed in this document are addressed in the *Guidelines*.

Advisement: At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document 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.

In the written annual evaluation, the department head will provide written advice to faculty below the rank of professor on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure (if appropriate).

Third-year review: In the spring of the third year each assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections IV and V of the promotion dossier described in the *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 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 publications and works in progress, visit several classes, read through 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.

The head will present the report to the eligible faculty (the *Guidelines* define faculty eligibility and voting procedures) at a faculty meeting scheduled for this purpose. The

faculty will then discuss and vote on the following question:

“Has [Candidate’s name] made sufficient progress towards tenure and/or promotion to [the next rank]?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. If the majority of faculty vote “No”, a second vote will be taken on the following question:

“Shall the candidate’s contract be terminated?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. Candidates who receive a majority of “Yes” votes on the question will not be continued in the department.

The head will meet with the candidate and give him/her a written statement of the departmental vote(s) that includes a report of the relevant discussion within 3 days of the vote. Regardless of the outcome of the vote, the candidate will have the option of responding to the report in writing and the candidate’s response will become part of the record of the Third Year Review.

The candidate may request reconsideration of an unfavorable faculty vote. The reconsideration request must be submitted within 10 working days of the receipt by the candidate of the report from the department head. The candidate may supply additional material in support of her/his case in the reconsideration request and may present his/her case to the eligible faculty in person. Reconsideration shall culminate in a second faculty vote to address the questions above. If the vote on the second question (“shall the candidates contract be terminated”) is affirmative, the candidate’s contract will not be renewed. The department head will prepare a brief written report of the reconsideration discussion, including the outcome of the vote. This report shall be given to the candidate within 3 working days of the meeting. This second report, as well as any additional materials submitted by the candidate to support her/his case shall also become part of the record of the Third Year Review.

Preliminary Consideration: The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in 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 vita, copies of publications, and statement of achievements in teaching, research and service to the department head. The head will appoint a committee of eligible faculty to review these materials and report to the faculty on them. This report will be based on review of publications, teaching evaluations, visits to classes, and other materials. All faculty eligible to vote on this candidate will have access to these materials. At a meeting of eligible faculty held by April 15, the committee will present its report. The faculty will vote on the following question:

“Should [Candidate’s name] 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 of Marine Sciences will follow the *Guidelines*.

In addition, the candidate will make available by August 1 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. Books or manuscripts that have been accepted but not yet published may be submitted if accompanied by a letter of formal acceptance from the Editor or publisher. Books or manuscripts that have not yet been accepted for publication (e.g. “submitted,” “in review,” “in preparation,” “in progress,” etc.) 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 on or by September 1 to discuss the candidate’s accomplishments and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote on each candidate the head will announce how he/she voted. The faculty will vote on the following questions:

“Should [Candidate’s name] be promoted to the rank of [next rank]?”

“Should [Candidate’s name] be tenured?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on these questions by secret ballot as per the *Guidelines*. The results will be conveyed in writing by the head to the candidate within three working days of the vote.

Requests for reconsideration by candidates who do not receive a positive recommendation (simple majority of votes from eligible faculty present) must be handled in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

CRITERIA FOR THE RANKS

FOR TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR:

The criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Department of Marine Sciences are based on the precept that the candidate must “demonstrate excellence in instruction” and “show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as a regional or national authority, unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level,” in which case they should “demonstrate exemplary service to Society, the University and the profession.” These are the underlying precepts of Tenure and Promotion in the Department of Marine Sciences and supercede any of the more specific guidelines presented below.

If the department hires a faculty member whose activities will result in different kinds of teaching, research or service productivity than are included below, 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. Furthermore, it is recognized that measures of success change through time. Thus, these criteria will be reviewed on a regular basis (at least once every 5 years) and revised as necessary. The guidelines in effect at the time a faculty member is hired will be used to evaluate that faculty member.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in Teaching: On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show clear excellence as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. The candidate should participate in specialty courses in their area of specialization as appropriate. The candidate should establish a lab group consisting of graduate students, undergraduates and postdocs (the last two are desirable but not required).

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in classroom instruction during the period of evaluation 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.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in Research: The departmental expectation is that faculty who qualify for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must achieve a level of productivity commensurate with the leaders of their field of scientific endeavor and they must demonstrate progress to establishing a national reputation, with the expectation that this will lead to significant extramural support for their work. Publications should stem from work conducted in the candidate’s lab at UGA (not dissertation chapters or papers from postdoctoral studies).

As a guideline, it is suggested that the candidate should have published, or have scheduled for publication by the August 1 deadline, an average of at least 1 paper per year over the review period, published in the top tier, rigorously peer-reviewed journals of the candidate's field of study. For publications on which the candidate was not the lead or corresponding author, the candidate's intellectual contribution should be corroborated by the lead author of the paper.

For the purposes of this evaluation, online journal publications count equally with print publications as long as they are rigorously peer-reviewed. Awarded patents are counted as qualifying publications. Other forms of publication such as sole-authored books, book chapters, technical reports, etc. that are not peer-reviewed or for which peer-review is less than rigorous, will be evaluated on an *ad hoc* basis through discussions among the tenured faculty of the Department. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the impact of these publications. This documentation will be included in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Evidence of emerging regional or national recognition for their research should be documented in the form of citations to their publications by other authors, especially in review articles; awards; external letters of assessment; references to their work in the popular press or broadcast media; and other information that helps demonstrate the level of recognition attained by the candidate.

The candidate should also attain a level of extramural support that is adequate to meet the demands of supporting the research productivity described above and to demonstrate recognition of their research program by the broader community. Generally this suggests that the candidate should serve as Project Director or Lead Investigator on at least 1 research grant from Federal agencies, foundations and other not-for-profits, or corporations whose primary mission is to fund research (for example NSF or NIH). This does not include equipment or construction grants, contracts simply to supply analytical services, or small project development grants. Preferably there will be some indication that continued support is likely. The candidate's role in multi-investigator awards (and intellectual contribution to the proposal), must be clearly defined, regardless of whether or not they are listed as Project Director or Lead Investigator.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in Service: Unless some portion of their EFT is allocated to service, successful candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or for tenure are expected to attend departmental meetings, to serve on student committees, and, if asked, to provide limited service on departmental or 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 or excessive service as a reviewer for journals or funding agencies, while it helps to enhance the candidates visibility and reputation, does not help meet these criteria.

Candidates whose EFT is allocated in part to service will be expected to conduct outreach and service activities that demonstrate exemplary service to Society, the University and the profession as defined by the Vice President for Service and in proportion to their EFT allocation.

FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR:

The criteria for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Marine Sciences are based on the precept that the candidate 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. Unless the candidate’s assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national and international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.” The candidate should be able to demonstrate leadership and their membership in the department should enhance its visibility and reputation. If their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level, the candidate should “demonstrate exemplary service to Society, the University and the profession and the likelihood of maintaining that stature” These are the underlying precepts for Promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Marine Sciences and supercede any of the more specific guidelines presented below.

If the department hires a faculty member whose activities will result in different kinds of teaching, research or service productivity than are included below, 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. Furthermore, it is recognized that measures of success change through time. Thus, these criteria will be reviewed on a regular basis (at least once every 5 years) and revised as necessary. The guidelines in effect at the time a faculty member is hired will be used to evaluate that faculty member.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in Teaching: On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show clear and consistent excellence as a teacher in the classroom; in student advisement, in direction of graduate students, independent studies students or interns and in other forms of instruction involving students. The candidate should present specialty courses in their area of specialization. The candidate should have established a strong and productive lab group that includes graduate and undergraduate students and should, by the time they are promoted to Full Professor, have graduated one or more Ph.D. students.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in Research: The departmental expectation is that faculty who qualify for promotion to Full Professor must achieve and maintain a level of productivity commensurate with the leaders of their field of scientific endeavor and they must demonstrate a national and international reputation, with significant and consistent extramural support for

their work.

As a guideline, it is suggested that the candidate should have published, or have scheduled for publication by the August 1 deadline, an average of at least 2 papers per year over the review period, published in the top tier, rigorously peer-reviewed journals of the candidate's field of study. Publication in high impact journals with a broad readership (e.g. Science, Nature, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, etc.) are specifically encouraged. For publications on which the candidate was not the lead or corresponding author, the candidate's intellectual contribution should be corroborated by the lead author of the paper.

For the purposes of this evaluation, online journal publications count equally with print publications as long as they are rigorously peer-reviewed. Awarded patents are counted as qualifying publications. Other forms of publication such as sole-authored books, book chapters, technical reports, etc. that are not peer-reviewed or for which peer-review is less than rigorous, will be evaluated on an *ad hoc* basis through discussions among the tenured faculty of the Department. It is the candidate's responsibility to document the impact of these publications. This documentation will be included in the promotion and tenure dossier.

Evidence of national, and especially international, recognition for their research is documented in the form of invited reviews, invited participation in hallmark symposia or colloquia, citations to their publications, awards, external letters of assessment, references to their work in the popular press or broadcast media, and other information that helps demonstrate the level of recognition attained by the candidate. Letters of assessment should be sought from leaders in the candidate's field of study including, if possible, members of the National Academy of Sciences and Engineering or equivalent and from leading foreign scientists.

The candidate should also have maintained a high level of extramural support from funding sources that demonstrate recognition of their program by the broader research community. The candidate is encouraged take a leading role in multi-investigator awards and the candidate's roles in these projects (and intellectual contribution to the proposal), must be clearly defined.

Guidelines for Evaluating Achievements in 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.