

Promotion/Tenure Criteria Department of Genetics April 2015

The following guidelines and criteria provide information on how promotion and tenure shall be handled in the Department of Genetics, and on the criteria approved by this faculty for promotion and for tenure. In all matters related to third-year review and promotion and tenure, the unit will follow and adhere to the latest online iteration of the *University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure*. These unit-specific guidelines and criteria provide specific information on how third-year review, promotion and tenure will be handled in the unit. All relevant information relating to standards, criteria, and procedures for evaluating faculty performance for the purposes of Annual Evaluation, Third-year Reviews, and promotion and tenure in Genetics is included in this document and no other document exists. University

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Genetics 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.

Faculty in the Department of Genetics will normally have appointments detailing the percent effort in research/scholarship and teaching. Rarely faculty will also have explicit service responsibilities; however, all faculty are expected to contribute to service to the department, university, their profession and society.

Formal votes require a quorum of the faculty of appropriate in rank (see *Guidelines*), be present. As per University rules, absentee ballots are permitted but do not count toward a quorum. The Department of Genetics Bylaws defines a quorum as a simple majority.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Genetics, 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, the faculty, dean and the Provost, must approve any changes or updates to this PTU document. 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 will be advised in writing about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure. For new faculty appointed at the beginning of spring semester, the memorandum of understanding associated with the initial letter of appointment will clearly specify when the "tenure clock" begins.

For Assistant Professors, the Head will appoint a tenured faculty as a mentor, whose role is to advise the newly appointed member on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion and tenure. The mentor can be recommended by the Assistant Professor. This does not preclude informal mentoring, but the appointed mentor serves as someone who has agreed to provide advice when asked and to informally follow the progress and accomplishments of the Assistant Professor.

The Head of Department shall meet with every untenured faculty member at least once a

year and provide both verbal and written feedback on their progress toward promotion and tenure. The Head of Department shall offer to meet with every Associate Professor each year. Associate Professors may decline a face-to-face meeting, but will in any case be provided with written evaluation of progress toward promotion from the Head of Department. In the written annual evaluation, the Head of Department will provide specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must accomplish for promotion to the next rank and for tenure (if appropriate).

Annual Evaluation

All faculty shall have an annual written evaluation conducted by the Head of Department. All faculty are provided with an opportunity to meet with the Head of Department to discuss their annual evaluation. The Head of Department shall meet with all Assistant Professors and Associate Professors, and advise them verbally (as well as in the written evaluation) of their progress toward promotion.

Annual evaluations will be in writing and shall provide an overview of the success of the department in teaching and research during the year of the evaluation. This will include information on the total and average number of papers, book chapters and books that are written by the faculty, the annual research spend on sponsored projects, and national and international awards. For each individual faculty member, their progress in teaching, research and service during that year will be documented. In addition, the Head of Department will provide an overall assessment and recognition of areas that were particularly excellent or guidance for areas that need improvement.

Annual evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the criteria used for promotion and tenure by the Department of Genetics. All evaluations will contain a clear statement indicating whether the departmental criteria are being met. A copy of the annual evaluation will be provided to the faculty member and will be held in the personnel file in the Department.

Third-year review of Assistant Professors

The CV provided for the third-year review must be in the promotion dossier format as described in the Administrative Guidelines on the Provost's web site, http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/admin_guidelines

The eligible (tenured) faculty will discuss and vote "Yes" or "No" on the following question:

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

At the same meeting, eligible faculty will take a second "Yes" or "No" vote on the following question: "[Candidate's name] should be renewed for the fourth year."

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 the votes on the report and renewal of the candidate are taken.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Assistant professors will be evaluated for their teaching by a minimum of two senior faculty

members, including in-person peer-evaluation of classroom teaching. The evaluators will attend at least three class periods and provide verbal and written evaluation of Assistant Professors regarding their instruction. The evaluators will then provide a written report to the Head of Department, and this evaluation will be used in the third-year review. Mentoring faculty are encouraged to give helpful advice and suggestions to the instructor at any time during the semester. Associate and Full Professors may also undergo periodic teaching evaluations employing the same format.

In the spring of the third year each Assistant Professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 (Appendix C) of the promotion dossier described in the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion & Tenure*. The Head of Department or an assigned faculty mentor will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy. This review will be a thorough, formative review of the Assistant Professor's progress mandated by the University and the College.

The Head of the Department will appoint a committee of at least three faculty members to review the Assistant Professor's dossier and performance. This committee will review publications and works in progress, and 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 findings 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 Assistant Professor being evaluated and the Head of the Department. The Assistant Professor also has the right to meet with the Head of the Department and the committee members individually or collectively to discuss the contents of the report.

At a regular departmental meeting in the spring semester the Head of Department will present the report to a quorum of tenured faculty (The *Guidelines* define faculty eligibility and quorum). The faculty will then discuss and vote on the following question: "[Candidate's name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion to [the next rank]." Faculty will vote "yes" or "no" by ballot. If the candidate does not receive a majority of "yes" votes, the faculty will then discuss and vote on whether to recommend continuation. If the vote is not to continue, the candidate's contract will not be renewed at the first opportunity to do so. A majority of faculty eligible to vote must be present when the votes are taken.

On the basis of this vote the Head of the Department will meet with the candidate and give him/her a written copy of the report and a written statement of the departmental vote. The Head of the Department will consult with reviewing committee members as to the accuracy of the report given to the candidate.

Preliminary Consideration for Promotion

The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the *Guidelines*. In the spring of the appropriate year, but no later than May 1, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will inform the Head of the Department in writing. The candidate will present a *Curriculum vitae* and a summary (1-3 pages) of teaching and research accomplishments that will be distributed to tenured faculty of the next rank. These faculty will then vote on whether to solicit outside letters of evaluation. The outcome of this vote will be conveyed to the candidate within three working days of the vote.

Following the vote and in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the Head of the Department will reveal how he/she voted. If the vote was "yes", the Head of the Department can work with the candidate to prepare the dossier and solicit external letters of evaluation. If the vote was "no", then an appropriate senior faculty member who voted "yes" will be charged with preparing the dossier and soliciting letters for the candidate.

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 Head of the Department or an appointed senior faculty member to prepare the dossier.

Formal Review

In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the *Guidelines*. In collaboration with the candidate, the Head of the Department or appointed senior faculty members will prepare the dossier for formal review and make it available for evaluation by faculty members eligible to vote. The dossier should be made available no later than the first day of August, for consideration at the first faculty meeting in the fall (i.e., August). The dossier will include an updated *Curriculum vita*, external letters of evaluation, and an achievements section as specified by the *Guidelines*. The senior faculty will then meet to discuss the candidate's credentials and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote in accordance with the *Guidelines*, the Head of the Department will indicate how he/she voted. If the vote was "yes", the Head of the Department can work with the candidate to prepare the final dossier and cover letter. If the vote was "no", then an appointed senior faculty member who voted "yes" will be charged to complete the dossier.

In accordance with the Principle of Flow in the *Guidelines*, the candidate's promotion and/or tenure dossier will pass to the next level of review independent of whether the department level recommendation was positive or negative. The candidate may terminate the process at any time.

Criteria For Tenure and for Promotion to Associate Professor and to Full Professor

Genetics faculty are expected to participate actively in academic research and scholarship, graduate and undergraduate instruction, and committee work and similar departmental and university assignments. Genetics faculty are not budgeted for formal service and are not evaluated on this, but all are expected to function in a professional and timely manner in their committee work and other responsibilities.

The University's Guidelines state the following criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor at the University of Georgia (see page 23):

Associate Professor: "Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional and national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level."

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. Unless the candidates' assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature."

The Department has developed discipline-specific criteria that, if met, will allow the candidate to meet or exceed the University's requirement for rank.

Research/Scholarship

With respect to scholarly research in Genetics, the primary criterion to be used for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure is evidence that the candidate can develop a sustainable research program while at the University of Georgia. Promotion to Professor requires evidence of sustained growth, both of international reputation and training activities. Research leading to the promotion to Professor is expected to have a demonstrable positive impact on their field of study. Sustainability includes a regular pattern of dissemination of research to the international community appropriate for their field of study. It also includes evidence of the ability to attract sufficient extramural funding to allow for the training of graduate students if a member of the graduate faculty, and/or postdoctoral scholars, and to allow these students and the candidate to pursue academic research in their area of study. The department recognizes that the quantity of funding required may vary among sub disciplines of Genetics, but evidence of the ability to fulfill graduate and/or postdoctoral training requires that there be sufficient funding to cover the stipends or wages of trainees as well as the costs of equipment and consumables for their research.

Publications

For tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, candidates are expected to have established a national reputation with clear path toward an international reputation in their field based on a body of published work. Publications should be in refereed journals that are widely available and typically accessible to an international audience. There must be evidence that the candidate has led the work and its dissemination. There must be sufficient publications from work carried out at the University of Georgia to provide evidence that a successful research program has been established and that it will be maintained into the future. The number of publications will vary by field, but a regular pattern of publishing and disseminating research is expected. The contribution of the candidate to multi-authored work should be made explicit.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, candidates are expected to have established a recognizable international reputation in their field based on a body of published work carried out at the University of Georgia. Publications are expected to appear in peer-reviewed journals that have an international reputation for quality. It is expected that the research of candidates for Full Professor will be well cited in their field (i.e., compared to others pursuing research in the same field of study), and are sought after as invited speakers, participants in symposia, or plenary speakers.

Works other than publications can be taken into account in assessing the international standing of a candidate. Publications, products (e.g., software, programs) and output beyond works published in scholarly journals are valuable evidence of scholarly activity as long as peer evaluation has occurred, and the relative contribution of the candidate is made clear. The guiding principle for assessing the value of all outputs will be documentation that the work has been evaluated externally and the community of researchers in the candidate's field finds value in the work. Thus, for example, books can be considered if there is evidence that these works have been adopted in courses in other universities, or have sufficient sales to indicate a strong international presence. An issued US patent can count as a publication provided there is evidence of some impact of this patent in the candidate's field of study or a commercial application. Information made available in national databases or on the web can be counted as a publication, providing there is evidence of peer evaluation and/or usage by others. For multi-authored works, the contribution of the

candidate must be made clear as well as the nature of the contribution of all other authors.

Funding

For all faculty with any of their EFT allocated to scholarly research, external funding is expected proportionate to the cost of research in the candidate's field. The quantity of funding is therefore specific to the field of study; the principle of developing a sustainable program that permits a pattern of regular publication and dissemination of research, training of doctoral students (if a member of the graduate faculty) and training of postdoctoral scholars will be applied. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, a record of renewing or maintaining grant funding is required, as well as a sustained record of training.

Collaborative Research

For any collaborative research, the candidate's role must be documented and explained. It is expected that the candidate played a significant creative role in the research project.

Other criteria

Other indicators of the quality of research can include internal or external recognition of the candidate's scholarly work. These might be, for example, awards or recognition by highly visible journals via editorial items, invited talks at symposia and research institutions, book chapters, organizing and/or chairing symposia sessions, service on grant agency panels and editorial boards, and service to professional societies.

Teaching

For most appointments where a portion of the EFT is assigned to teaching, teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level is expected. Teaching at the undergraduate level can include lecture courses, supervision of undergraduate research that is associated with independent research course numbers, and laboratory instruction. Teaching at graduate level may include lectures in courses listed at 6000 or above, supervision of doctoral students and postdoctoral scientists.

For promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, candidates are expected to demonstrate effective teaching. Traditional evidence for effective teaching includes the development or redevelopment of classroom or laboratory courses that attract a sustainable number of students. Teaching is not limited to the classroom, and effective teaching can be demonstrated by other activities. On-line courses, web sites, and other online education activities are important avenues for disseminating knowledge. However, such teaching activities must be created in a manner that the department can assess their effectiveness and is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Effective mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, and advising of students, is also included under teaching, and demonstrated by progress of students toward degrees and successful scholarship in the form of presentations at national or international meetings, grants, awards and publications by students and postdoctoral scholars.

For promotion to Professor, candidates are expected to have continued to meet the expectations for effective teaching, and to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Evidence for having achieved excellence should come from a variety of sources. Evidence of excellence in teaching includes: consistently above average peer and student teaching evaluations, university, national and international teaching awards and recognition, running national or international workshops or short-courses, innovations in the classroom that are

adopted by others, success of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows indicated by completion of their degree, publications, grants, awards, and fellowships awarded to the student or postdoctoral scholar. Obtaining a further position by students or postdoctoral scholars mentored by the candidate is considered evidence of excellence. Excellence is also demonstrated by holding a substantive leadership role in the Department (such as the undergraduate or graduate coordinator position) that leads to curriculum reform or other improvements in the department's courses, as is participation in a leadership position in national organizations that develop higher education and educational activities. Nominations by students for teaching awards are evidence of excellence.

Candidates whose annual evaluations reflects difficulty or deficiencies in teaching must demonstrate that problems have been addressed and improvement has occurred by the time of Promotion and Tenure.

Service

All faculty are expected to provide service to the department and the university by service on committees. Senior faculty are expected to carry a heavier load of academic governance than an Assistant Professor.

Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation play a critical role in the promotion and tenure process by giving the reviewing faculty an independent assessment of the candidate's qualifications. Generally, external referees will be Full Professors or their equivalent and recognized experts with international reputations in the candidate's field of study and scholarship. Because letters of reference often refer only to research, the department will make efforts to ensure that contributions to teaching are also fairly evaluated by individuals outside the department. This will occur through the use of outside peer evaluations of teaching and other evidence that the candidate is a superior educator. Promotion dossiers will document that each referee is qualified to provide a fair and honest appraisal of the candidate's accomplishments.

Approved by the University, June 8, 2015