

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Chemistry will carefully 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 any 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.

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, department and university operations, 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 guidance as to what the faculty member should emphasize in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure.

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 to signify their agreement on the contents. Performance reviews are generally concluded by the end of February each year.

Third-year review: In the spring of the third year, by a deadline of April 20, each assistant professor must submit a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in Appendix C of the Guidelines. The department head or the chair of the departmental promotion and tenure committee will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier.

The department promotion and tenure committee will review the faculty member's dossier and performance. For assistant professors, the mentor will serve as an ad hoc member of this committee, if not already a member. This committee will review the dossier and other materials supplied by the candidate, such as publications, works in progress, grant proposal reviews, student and peer evaluations of teaching. On the basis of this review, the committee will write a detailed report 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 departmental meeting of tenured faculty held before the end of spring semester, the head or the chair of the promotion and tenure committee will present the report to the faculty. The faculty will then discuss and vote on the following question:

“[Candidate’s name] has made sufficient progress to justify continuation on a track towards tenure and/or promotion to [the next rank].”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. Candidates receiving a “No” vote from the majority of the tenured faculty will not be continued in the department. The head will meet with the candidate and give him or her a written statement of the departmental vote.

Preliminary Consideration: The department will follow procedures for preliminary consideration presented in section VI C of *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 must communicate this wish in writing to the department head.

The candidate will by the March 1 deadline submit to the department head 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. The promotion and tenure committee will review these materials and report to the faculty. This report will be based on review of publications, grant support, invited seminars, student and peer teaching evaluations, 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:

“[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 business days of the vote.

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 the chair of the promotion and tenure committee to prepare the dossier and solicit external evaluations in accord with Section VII A of the *Guidelines*.

Formal Review: In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the *Guidelines*, see sections VII and X.

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 and other supporting documentation. Student letters may be submitted, if solicited by the department head or chair of the promotion and tenure committee from students on a list made available by the candidate. All evaluations for all courses taught must be submitted or be made available 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 articles or books 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 must be made available to the department head by August 1.

The eligible 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.

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 a national authority in their discipline.

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 demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in direction of graduate or undergraduate research, or other forms of instruction involving students.

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly or exclusively in instruction, evidence of an emerging national reputation for excellence in teaching is expected. With few exceptions, this should include the following: significant curriculum enhancements or innovations; publications and presentations related to teaching; grants related to instruction; involvement in professional organizations related to chemical education; local, regional or national awards. An emerging national reputation for excellence in teaching should also be apparent in letters from external assessors.

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 chemistry, standard metrics used to measure research performance include research publications, invited research presentations, and external research funding. A chemistry faculty member who is successfully considered for tenure and promotion to associate professor has typically:

- (a) published 9-11 research publications in high-quality, refereed journals. 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 but not all of the publications. For co-authored works on which the candidate is not corresponding author, credit is distributed among the senior authors. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;
- (b) presented 3-5 invited seminars on his/her research at nationally recognized meetings or peer academic institutions;

- (c) demonstrated the ability to obtain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of his/her independent research program. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive major research grant for which the candidate is the 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 or invited seminars 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 tenure and/or promotion to associate professor 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. 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 a high level of professional accomplishment as demonstrated by national or international recognition in their discipline 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, the candidate must demonstrate effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in direction of graduate or undergraduate research, or other forms of instruction involving students.

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly or exclusively in instruction, evidence of a national reputation for excellence in teaching is expected. This should include all of the following: significant curriculum enhancements or innovations; publications and presentations related to teaching; grants related to instruction; involvement in professional organizations related to chemical education; local, regional or national awards. A national reputation for excellence in teaching should also be apparent in letters from external assessors.

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 chemistry, standard metrics used to measure research performance include research publications, invited research presentations, and external research funding. A chemistry faculty member who is successfully considered for promotion to full professor has typically:

- (a) published research articles in high-quality refereed journals at an annual rate of 3-4 per year for a period of at least four years immediately prior to consideration. 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 but not all of the publications. For co-authored works on which the candidate is not corresponding author, credit is distributed among the senior authors. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;
- (b) presented 2-3 invited seminars per year on his/her research at national or international meetings or at peer academic institutions for a period of at least four years immediately prior to consideration;
- (c) demonstrated the ability to maintain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of his/her independent research program for a period of at least four years immediately prior to consideration. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive major research grant for which the candidate is 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 promotion. For example, fewer publications or invited seminars 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 national and international 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, College and University committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. 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. Organization of professional meetings, editorial work, or leadership positions in professional organizations, does help meet these criteria.

Changes to this document:

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Chemistry, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, 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.

Approved by the University, June 8, 2015