

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

From the bylaws of
The Department of Mathematics and Science Education
Revised June 2015

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Mathematics and Science Education will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* (hereafter referred to as *Guidelines*). The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the *Guidelines*. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) document and the *Guidelines*. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the *Guidelines* will supersede this document. This PTU document provides specific information on procedures that will be followed and on the criteria for promotion and for tenure in the Department of Mathematics and Science Education. New faculty members must be provided with these PTU Guidelines and *Guidelines*. These procedures and criteria will apply to all faculty from the approved date forward. Questions not addressed by the content of this document are referred to the *Guidelines*¹.

Overview of Department

The Department of Mathematics and Science Education includes faculty with a broad range of research interests, foundational disciplines, and methodological approaches. This diversity produces differences in the type of scholarship engaged in by the department's members, the professional organizations to which they present their work, the type of research in which they engage including variations in the methodology they use, the nature of the published works, and the professional communities they seek to influence and serve. Because of this diversity in types of scholarship, the Department of Mathematics and Science Education has established broad yet legitimate criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure consistent with *Guidelines* on appointment, promotion, and tenure. Criteria required for faculty to establish eligibility to vote on appointments, third-year reviews, promotions and tenure are stipulated in the *Guidelines*.

Appointments

In all matters relating to the search and appointment of new faculty members, the Department of Mathematics and Science Education will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the *Guidelines* (with particular attention to Section V, Procedures for Appointment, p. 27) and will follow the time-tables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the policies of College of Education.

At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be advised about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure including the long-range needs of the department. The newly appointed faculty member will also be informed that the annual evaluations will serve as a basis for the PTU head (and then the third year review committee) to advise the faculty member regarding their progress toward promotion and tenure.

¹ Similar criteria apply to faculty in non-tenured tracks (cf. *Guidelines*, pp. 22, 26)

In the PTU head's annual evaluations and in the mentoring committee's third year review, the criteria for promotion to associate professor and for tenure described by the *Guidelines* and the Mathematics and Science Education By-Laws will be emphasized to the faculty member.

The Department of Mathematics and Science Education believes that the professional development of each faculty member is an important joint responsibility. For newly appointed assistant professors, a **mentoring committee** is highly recommended and will consist of at least three faculty mentors. The PTU Head in consultation with the faculty member will approve the mentoring committee. The purpose of the mentoring committee is to advise the faculty member on matters of research and teaching, review his/her progress, recommend activities for progress toward promotion and tenure, and submit an annual review to the PTU Head. For faculty seeking promotion to Professor, the mentoring committee is optional and its existence determined by the individual faculty member in consultation with the PTU head. Any mentor assignment can change upon agreement among the faculty member, the mentor, and the PTU Head. It will be the responsibility of the Personnel and Professional Development committee to be responsive to concerns that may develop with the mentoring process.

Promotion

In all matters relating to the promotion of faculty members from any present rank to a higher rank, the Department of Mathematics and Science Education will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the *Guidelines* (especially the standards and documentation specified in Section VII, Procedures for Promotion, p. 27) and will follow the time-tables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the policies of the College of Education.

Third Year Review

In the spring of the third year, each assistant professor will submit a dossier that conforms to Sections 4 (Vita) and 5 (Achievements) of the promotion and tenure dossier described the *Guidelines* (see pages 25 and 26 of Guidelines and also Appendix C on pages 46 and 47). The PTU Head and mentoring committee will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

Consistent with MSE By-Laws and Section VI part C (p. 25) of the *Guidelines*, the PTU Head will appoint a third year review committee consisting of at least three faculty members in consultation with the candidate to review the faculty member's performance based on information in the dossier. Members of the mentoring committee may serve on the third year review committee.

The third year review committee will review the dossier. On the basis of this review, the committee will write a report that presents its finding in detail and that makes clear recommendations to the candidate concerning his or her progress towards promotion and tenure. In particular, the report will address the question of whether the candidate is progressing in a satisfactory manner towards meeting PTU criteria for promotion and tenure. A copy of the report will be given to both the candidate and the PTU Head. At a regular departmental meeting, with a quorum of eligible faculty present, the PTU Head will present the report to the faculty. The faculty will then discuss and vote on the following statement:

“[Candidate’s name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion and/or tenure to [the next rank (with tenure)].”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on the question of sufficient progress towards promotion and/or tenure. On the basis of this vote, the PTU Head will meet with the candidate and give him/her a letter that includes a written statement of the departmental vote. The candidate may reply in writing to the report and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU Head’s letter, and any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.

Preliminary Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

During the Fall Semester, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the next year will communicate this wish in writing to the PTU Head. The candidate will present a current vita in the format specified by the *Guidelines*, a two-page statement of accomplishments, copies of the proposed exhibits, and a list of six names of possible external evaluators (with a brief biographical sketch and all contact information) to the PTU Head. The mentoring committee and the PTU Head will review and discuss these materials with the candidate. The candidate will revise the materials as needed and present a final version together with the third-year review letter and original letter of appointment to the PTU Head. The PTU Head will make these materials available to all faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. At a meeting of eligible faculty a vote on the following question will be held:

“[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 PTU Head in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote.

Formal Review for Promotion and Tenure

Candidates eligible for promotion and/or tenure will work with the PTU Head and/or the mentoring committee to prepare the dossier. In addition, the PTU Head will solicit letters of evaluation from external evaluators following procedures in the Guidelines. The PTU Head must select and include in the dossier, letters of evaluation from at least two of the candidate’s designated external evaluators and will inform the candidate in writing when the letters have arrived. The candidate can also construct a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. There should be no contact at all with these individuals during the promotion and/or tenure review. The dossier must also include at least two letters from individuals not on the candidate’s approved list. The PTU Head will consult with the eligible voting faculty to determine a list of possible external evaluators not on the candidate’s list and to establish the priority in which proposed evaluators will be contacted. None of those individuals chosen should be the candidate’s dissertation advisor, co-author, or co-principal investigator. It is generally expected that the external evaluators will be nationally recognized in the candidate’s area of expertise, or a closely related area, and must hold or be above the rank desired by the candidate. The PTU Head will secure agreements to conduct the evaluation from evaluators and then send the candidate’s materials to them.

The candidate's dossier will be made available for review to all faculty eligible to vote. The candidate's dossier will be considered at a meeting scheduled for this purpose, with a quorum consisting of at least two-thirds of the faculty who are eligible to vote. All eligible faculty shall vote by secret ballot, "yes", or "no". Following the vote (after each candidate if there are more than one being considered at that time) the PTU Head will announce how he/she voted.

Instructions to the faculty by the PTU head during the reading of the dossier and at the time of the vote

The department head should advise the faculty to evaluate the dossier according to the *Guidelines* and the MSE By-Laws. This reminder is used to ensure that the dossier is evaluated according to the criteria appropriate to the rank being sought. The PTU head will also remind the faculty that the task is to evaluate the quality of the work put forward by the candidate and that a positive promotion vote may be given to extraordinary candidates who have met the University criteria in unique ways. The PTU head will also instruct the department faculty members who are eligible to vote in the given situation that the evaluation of faculty being considered for promotion and tenure must consider "assigned time" allocated for teaching, research or service. It will be emphasized that the allocation of time for these components of the faculty members' work load can vary widely across different faculty rank codes and titles (For further information see: UGA Faculty Rank Codes By BOR/UGA Faculty Rank Titles http://provost.uga.edu/documents/Faculty_Job_Rank_Codes.pdf). For instance, UGA policy requires that: "The Academic Professional designation may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment" (<http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies/academic-affairs-policy-manual/1-02-6-academic-professionals>).

The criteria described below will be applied to other faculty classifications such that promotion from the rank of academic professional associate to academic professional (or from clinical assistant professor to clinical associate professor or from assistant research scientist to associate research scientist or from public service assistant to public service associate) will use the criteria below for promotion to associate professor. Likewise, promotion from the rank of academic professional to senior academic professional (or from clinical associate professor to clinical professor or from associate research scientist to senior research scientist or from public service associate to senior public service associate) will use the criteria listed below for promotion to the rank of professor (see *Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Clinic Faculty*). But it must be emphasized again that assigned work time will be the most important metric for determining how to evaluate quantity and quality of work within a given component (teaching, research, service) of the criteria.

Specific Criteria for the Ranks

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor. For tenure and for promotion to associate professor, "candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level" (*Guidelines*, p. 23). These specific criteria are addressed within the paragraphs of the document that immediately follow.

Teaching. Faculty who qualify for promotion to associate professor are expected to have demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher in departmental programs. As described in the *Guidelines*, effectiveness in teaching is a basic expectation and it is “reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum” (*Guidelines*, p. 14). Documentation that may be used in providing evidence of effective teaching is enumerated in the *Guidelines* (pp. 14-16). In addition to those evidences listed in the *Guidelines*, candidates may further demonstrate effectiveness as a university teacher by means of scholarship in teaching. Documentation of scholarship in teaching may include publication of scholarly works concerning university teaching; publication of textbooks; making presentations related to scholarship of teaching at regional, national, or international conferences; innovative courses or seminars; and direction of graduate student work including internships, independent studies, and theses and dissertations. Documentation of effectiveness as a teacher may also include a demonstration of positive impact on practicing precollege teachers by means of student evaluations; participation in department, college, or university activities related to teaching; positive peer reviews; teaching awards or honors; and positively evaluated supervision or coordination of teacher education activities.

Research. Candidates for associate professor in the Department of Mathematics and Science Education are expected have a research program underway that is directed toward improvements in the teaching and learning of mathematics and/or science at the precollege or college level. A record of accomplishments in research in keeping with guidelines set by the University is expected for promotion. Ways of documenting accomplishments in research and scholarly activities are provided in the *Guidelines* (pp. 17-18). The departmental expectation is that the problems under investigation in the candidate’s program of research are directed toward establishing fundamental understanding into the teaching and learning of mathematics and/or science. The quality of the research should be comparable to that of individuals seeking promotion to associate professor in other nationally recognized programs. The quality of the research program may be documented by published or in-press articles in peer-reviewed journals; refereed book chapters; edited books; refereed conference proceedings; refereed online publications; graduate student research and publications; and research presentations at regional, national, or international conferences. External reviewers’ comments also will be used to evaluate the importance and impact of the research. Proposals submitted to funding agencies to support research should also be evident.

Service. During the time a faculty member is an assistant professor, he or she is expected to concentrate on teaching and research. However, in the Department of Mathematics and Science Education, successful candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected to have attended departmental meetings, have limited service on doctoral student committees if asked, have limited service on departmental and college committees, and contribute to the development and implementation of academic programs or projects. Candidates are also expected to attend and participate in professional meetings, perform editorial work and peer review, and be involved in other professional activities as appropriate.

For Promotion to Professor

For promotion to 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 candidate's assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature" (*Guidelines*, p. 23). Promotion to professor requires attainment of a level of performance and scholarship in teaching, research and service beyond that required for an associate professor. The dossier should provide documentation of a well-established line of scholarship and research activities and sustained and important achievements in teaching, research, and service since the date of promotion to the rank associate professor.

Teaching. Faculty who qualify for promotion to professor are expected to have demonstrated excellence as a university teacher in departmental programs as "reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum" (*Guidelines*, p. 14). Documentation that may be used in providing evidence of effective teaching is enumerated in the *Guidelines* (pp. 14-16). Candidates for professor may further demonstrate excellence as a university teacher by means of scholarship in teaching. Documentation of scholarship in teaching may include publication of scholarly work concerning university teaching; publication of textbooks related to university teaching; peer reviewed presentations at regional, national, or international conferences; innovative courses or seminars; direction of graduate student work including theses and dissertations, internships, or independent studies; integration of research into teaching; and by grants related to teaching. Documentation of excellence as a university teacher may also include positive impact on preservice or inservice teachers by means of student or peer evaluations; positive impact on graduate students by means of student or peer evaluations; student or peer evaluation of innovative undergraduate or graduate level courses; participation in department, college, or university activities related to teaching (such as committees on instruction); teaching awards or honors; and supervision or coordination of teacher education activities. Although these sources of documentation are similar to those for promotion to associate professor, depth and the extent of scholarship is expected to be greater for promotion to professor. In particular, such scholarship should demonstrate that the candidate infuses and applies appropriate research in the planning and conduct of courses.

Research. Ways of documenting accomplishments in research and scholarly activities are provided in the *Guidelines* (pp. 17-18). The departmental expectation in research for promotion to professor is to have demonstrated excellence as a researcher and have a substantial, well-established, programmatic, and progressive line of research and scholarship that is making important contributions to the body of knowledge within the disciplinary specialty of the individual comparable in quality to that of individuals seeking promotion to professor at other nationally recognized research programs. This can be accomplished by the publication of research in peer-reviewed journals; refereed book chapters; edited books; refereed conference proceedings; refereed online publications; graduate student research and publications; research presentations at regional, national, or international conferences; or publication in other high impact journals that cover the entire field of educational research (e.g. *American Education Research Journal*, *Review of Educational Research*, *Cognition and Instruction*, etc.). External reviewers' comments about and reference to citations of the research in publications of other scholars should clearly indicate a high level of importance and impact of their research and scholarship. The candidate must also document the historical impact of their research program and its future prospects. The candidate may provide evidence through a variety of artifacts, including peer reviews of their research program; published or in press manuscripts in refereed

professional journals; book chapters; authored or edited books; edited anthologies or co-edited anthologies; refereed conference proceedings; refereed online publications; graduate student research and publications; and research presentations at regional, national, or international conferences. Evidence in the form of invited presentations at national and international meetings, scholarly reviews, citations, awards, externally funded projects, and external letters of assessment illustrate ways to demonstrate the candidate's level of national and international recognition for research.

Service. There are three types of service defined in the *Guidelines* (pp. 18-19); service to society, service to the university, and service to the profession. Candidates for professor are expected to have used their academic and professional expertise in at least one of these three types of service. Types of evidence that can be used to document service are contained in the *Guidelines* (pp. 19-21). Service to the university includes participation in departmental, school/college, and/or university work/governance; administrative support work (such as serving as chair of a major, labor-intensive committee); or development, implementation, or management of academic programs or projects. Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and review of manuscripts in professional associations and learned societies publications; and review of grants applications. Quality pro bono service is also valued, and includes significant service to scholarly and professional organizations; involvement in statewide and national initiatives; participation on journal editorial boards; and involvement in educational settings including individual schools, school districts, and state-level organizations.

Tenure

Candidates for tenure must have a record of exemplary performance in the discharge of their primary responsibilities in teaching; research or other creative activities; and service to society, the University, and the profession (*Guidelines*, p. 40). A recommendation for tenure will require performance at the level specified for the rank at which either or both is being sought as described in the *Guidelines* of the University of Georgia and in the previous sections of this document. In all matters relating to the tenure of faculty members, the Department of Mathematics and Science Education will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the *Guidelines* (especially Section X, Procedures for Tenure, pp. 39-42) and will follow the timetables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education. In addition, tenure in the Department of Mathematics and Science Education will be recommended only if the candidate's current productivity in research and scholarship is likely to continue going forward, and if there is a long-range need for candidate's professional competence, expertise, duties, and responsibilities.