

Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Criteria

Department of Microbiology

Approved by the:

Department of Microbiology April 1, 2015

Dean, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences May 1, 2015

Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost June 8, 2015

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

This document and the discipline-specific criteria therein have been accepted by the faculty in the Department of Microbiology, and 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 document and the *University Guidelines*. In addition, any changes or updates to this document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the document.

II. Procedures:

A. Advisement: At the time of appointment, new faculty members will be given copies of both the Department of Microbiology *Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Criteria* and the *University Guidelines*. New faculty members will sign a letter acknowledging receipt and understanding of these guidelines. The department head will appoint a three-member mentoring committee of senior faculty in the department or faculty with appropriate expertise for each new assistant professor, to advise him / her on matters pertaining to teaching, research, service, departmental issues in general, and promotion and tenure. That committee will meet with the junior faculty member at least once a year to review his / her progress relative to criteria for promotion and tenure and provide professional guidance. The chair of this committee will provide a written report to the head within two weeks of each evaluation meeting. The faculty member may respond in writing to the report, and any response becomes a part of the report. Copies of the report will be placed in the faculty member's file and given to the faculty member. In addition to guidance from the mentoring committee, the department head will provide in the written Annual Evaluation for faculty below the level of professor, a clear assessment of the individual's progress towards meeting all discipline-specific criteria of the Department for promotion and tenure,

identifying areas where these criteria are not being met, and providing specific recommendations regarding what the faculty member must do to meet those criteria.

- B. Third-year review:** Before the end of spring semester of their third year, each assistant professor will submit a dossier prepared according to the *University Guidelines*. 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 dossier will be evaluated by a third-year review committee consisting of three tenured faculty members (associate or full professor), chosen by the department head from faculty in the Department of Microbiology or other units based upon their familiarity with research and funding in the candidate's area of expertise. The mentoring committee may also serve as the third-year review committee, at the discretion of the department head. By the end of the spring semester the third-year review committee will provide a written report to the candidate and the departmental faculty regarding the candidate's achievements in instruction, research and service, and specifically their progress towards promotion and tenure relative to each of the discipline-specific criteria of the Department. The written evaluation should clearly state if each of the criteria are being met. The candidate may provide additional information to the faculty in response to the report by the third-year review committee. At a regular meeting of the eligible faculty at which at least three-fourths of the eligible faculty are present, the department will consider the report by the third-year review committee and vote "yes" or "no" whether the candidate has made sufficient progress towards promotion and / or tenure. At the same meeting, the faculty will take a second "yes" or "no" vote on whether the candidate should be renewed for the fourth year. This meeting will be held before the 'Intent to Renew Contract' letter for the candidate is due.

The department head will provide to the candidate a written report summarizing the third year review and indicating the faculty vote. The candidate may respond in writing to the report, and any response becomes a part of the report. Copies of the report will be sent to the Dean of Arts and Sciences and included in the candidate's promotion / tenure dossier. Faculty who fail to receive a majority of "yes" votes for satisfactory progress may appeal this decision within 20 working days. During this time they may submit additional documentation of satisfactory progress towards promotion / tenure. At a regular meeting of the eligible faculty at which at least three-fourths of the eligible faculty are present, the department will reconsider its vote. Faculty who fail to receive a majority of "yes" votes for satisfactory progress will continue to receive annual advisement from the mentoring committee. However, consistent with the *University Guidelines*, in any year, the department head may determine not to extend a contract to a non-tenured faculty member. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the head by the unit faculty, consistent with the written criteria in this document.

- C. Preliminary Consideration:** A faculty member seeking consideration for promotion / tenure will submit a written request to the head no later than April 15th prior to the academic year in which the review process would occur. The candidate will provide at the time of this request electronic copies of the CV and dossier, as well as papers published or in press. By May 10th the eligible faculty will review these materials and vote whether to proceed with the promotion/tenure review. If the preliminary consideration is positive the candidate must provide the head within five working days (i) a list of four to six potential external evaluators, along with a paragraph for each detailing the reviewers' qualifications and contact information. Collaborators may be considered but their ability to make an impartial assessment must be clearly articulated. (ii) A list of no more than three individuals and their affiliations who may not be contacted to provide an external review; and (iii) electronic copies of updated CV and papers for the external reviewers.
- D. Formal Consideration:** The eligible faculty will meet in early to mid-August to discuss and vote on a recommendation for promotion and tenure.

III. Requirements for Ranks:

Associate Professor: Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as national authorities in their fields.

Professor: Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in their fields and the missions of the Department of Microbiology, demonstrating international recognition and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Criteria: The responsibilities (i.e., EFT) of the faculty in the department are assigned in the areas of: instruction; research and scholarship; and service. The application of the following criteria in evaluating a faculty member for promotion and tenure will be weighted according to EFT distribution.

A. Instruction

The Standard: Candidates are expected to contribute effectively to the instruction mission of the department, demonstrating effectiveness in instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels as reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. This includes but is not limited to classroom, on-line, and/or distance learning, as well as individualized training of undergraduate and graduate students. Faculty members with EFT in research are specifically expected to maintain membership on the Graduate Faculty and mentor graduate students towards the successful completion of their degree objectives. Candidates whose record reflects problems with effective instruction

based upon the following must document steps taken to correct such problems resulting in clear improvement by the time of promotion and tenure.

Required Documentation:

1. Student and peer evaluations indicative of effective undergraduate and/or graduate instruction. Evaluations are expected to demonstrate that the candidate provides a classroom environment that promotes student learning and inquiry. For joint instructional assignments the contributions of all instructors should be clear.
2. Mentoring undergraduate students in the research laboratory. Students are expected to engage in meaningful research activities which could be demonstrated by student presentations in lab meetings; written summaries of research findings prepared by students; inclusion of students as co-authors or their acknowledgement in peer-reviewed papers; or presentations or posters given by the students at local, regional or national conferences.
3. Thesis advisor for M.S. and Ph.D. students with satisfactory annual progress reviews by the students' advisory committees. The number of students for whom the candidate serves as thesis advisor can vary. Recent successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor have typically served as thesis advisor for 2 or more students, while recent successful candidates for promotion to Professor have typically served as thesis advisor for at least 5 students.
4. Manuscripts and abstracts for which the candidate's graduate students are authors, especially first authors. Ph.D. students mentored by successful candidates for promotion typically have 1 or more first author peer-reviewed papers by the time they complete the requirements for the degree.
5. Service on thesis advisory committees. Recent successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor have typically served on 4 or more thesis advisory committees (in addition to their own graduate students), while recent successful candidates for promotion to Professor have typically served on 6 or more thesis advisory committees (in addition to their own graduate students).

Additional Documentation: The candidate may use other types of documentation indicated in the *University Guidelines* as evidence of excellence in instruction.

B. Research and Scholarship

The Standard: The candidate must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging and sustainable stature as an authority in their research field. This includes (i) a regular pattern of dissemination of research findings of a coherent body of work in their field of study to the scientific community, and (ii) a demonstrated capacity to attract (Associate Professor) and sustain (Professor) sufficient extramural research funding to support an active, vigorous research

program. This would include the training of graduate and/or postdoctoral students sufficient to establish a national (associate professor) or international (professor) reputation in their field.

Required Documentation:

1. A coherent body of published, peer-reviewed work in the primary literature that resulted since their faculty appointment in the Department of Microbiology. Recent successful candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with a 0.5 EFT for research have typically had 4 to 7 peer-reviewed publications in journals that are well recognized among the strongest within the discipline. Recent successful candidates for promotion to Professor with a 0.5 EFT for research have typically had 10 to 18 peer-reviewed publications in journals with an international reputation for quality within the discipline, while at the rank of Associate Professor. These numbers of publications are not intended to be a requirement, or to rule out candidates who have a small number of high impact publications. They are meant to provide a range as guidance for inquiring candidates. The principal standard is quality of the candidate's work and research accomplishments, not merely quantity. For collaborative or multidisciplinary research publications the candidate's role and contribution should be made clear in the dossier by the candidate and the department head.
2. A vibrant research program that is supported by external funding. The candidate is expected to be the principal investigator for research grants providing external funding. Grant funding may come from federal granting agencies, foundations, private industry or other sources. The quantity of funding required is specific to the field of study; the principle to be applied is that of developing a sustainable program that permits a pattern of regular publication and dissemination of research, training of doctoral students and training of postdoctoral scholars. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, a record of renewing or maintaining grant funding is required, as well as a sustained training record.
3. Candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor will be well-cited in their field (i.e., compared to others pursuing research in the same field of study), sought after as invited speakers, participants in symposia, or plenary speakers.
4. Invited reviewer of manuscripts and/or grant proposals
5. Invited presentations of their research at professional conferences, other institutions, and/or private industry
6. While an international reputation is not expected for a candidate whose research component is in science education, the candidate must otherwise meet the required documentation detailed in III-B.2 above.

Additional Documentation: The candidate may use other types of documentation indicated in the *University Guidelines* as evidence of excellence in research and scholarship.

C. Service

The Standard and Required Documentation for service indicated below are meant for faculty who have EFT in service. For candidates who do not have EFT in service, examples of documentation for Service to the University and Profession are listed in the *University Guidelines*.

The Standard: The candidate must show clear and convincing evidence of recognition as a local and regional authority in community service and outreach. This includes developing and obtaining financial support for community and service outreach projects that involve student participation.

Required Documentation:

1. Establish innovative programs in community service and outreach.
2. Supervise undergraduate or graduate students in community service and outreach projects.
3. Develop and teach service learning courses or incorporate service learning components into existing courses.
4. Secure intramural or extramural funding for community service and outreach programs.
5. Publications related to community service, service learning or community outreach in journals, books or other appropriate media.
6. Indicators of professional reputation in service include but are not limited to:
 - a. Letters from community partners
 - b. Service on local, state or regional committees related to community service or outreach
 - c. Invitations to speak at local, state or regional meetings related to community service or outreach

Additional Documentation: The candidate may use other types of documentation indicated in the *University Guidelines* as evidence of excellence in service.

D. External Evaluations

1. External references are crucial to promotion and tenure. Evaluations of a candidate's professional reputation in research should be sought from full professors or their equivalent and are recognized nationally or internationally in the candidate's field. The department head will choose, in consultation with the eligible faculty in the department, three to four external reviewers. The department head will also choose, in consultation with the eligible faculty in the department, three to four external reviewers from the candidate's list. External reviews must be obtained from at least

two persons from each list. The external reviewers will be asked to provide a brief CV along with their reviews.

2. Peer evaluations in instruction should be sought from senior faculty at the University of Georgia.
3. Letters from former undergraduate and graduate students and post-doctoral trainees are considered an important element in documenting effectiveness in instruction and mentoring but are not considered external reviews.