

**Procedures and Policies Governing Nomination for Promotion to the ranks of
Associate Professor and Full Professor
in
the Department of Physics and Astronomy**

Approved by the Tenure Track Faculty: April 1, 2015

Approved by the University, June 8, 2015

SUPPLEMENT TO UGA GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND
TENURE: http://provost.uga.edu/documents/guidelines_revised_spring_14.pdf

PREAMBLE

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

The responsibilities of faculty in the Department of Physics and Astronomy are assigned in 3 broad areas: research and scholarship; teaching; service to the department, the university, the profession and society.

At the time of appointment, new faculty members will be given a copy of both the unit and the university guidelines for promotion and tenure. They will sign a letter acknowledging receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

All new faculty members will be appointed a faculty mentor from among the tenured faculty who will advise on matters of teaching, research, service, departmental issues in general, and promotion and tenure.

In the written annual faculty performance evaluation, the department head will provide 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 the areas of teaching, research and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure, if appropriate.

ANNUAL EVALUATION

Annual evaluations will be performed each year according to the Department's current Raise Allocation and Merit Point Policy, which is described in detail on the departmental website,

<http://www.physast.uga.edu/policies/Raise>

The Annual Evaluation document will include clear information as to whether the Physics and Astronomy criteria in, research and scholarship, teaching and service are being met.

In addition, faculty below the rank of Full professor will be provided with a promotion advisory statement as part of their annual evaluation.

THIRD YEAR REVIEW

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 *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* (pp. 25-26; sections VI.C and VI.D) suggest the third-year review is separate and distinct from the renewal vote. The third-year review report provides feedback and advice to faculty on their progress towards promotion and tenure, while the renewal vote is quite a different matter. Units should conduct separate votes on the third-year review report and on renewal.

The 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, 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 Third Year Review documentation will include clear information as to whether the Physics and Astronomy criteria in, research and scholarship, teaching and service are being met. 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.

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 eligible faculty will vote on the following question (for Assistant Professors):

“[Candidate’s name] should be formally reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor and/or for tenure.”

The eligible faculty will vote on the following question (for Associate Professors):

“[Candidate’s name] should be formally reviewed for promotion to Professor.”

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.

I. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Each candidate must satisfy the requirements set forth in the Guidelines. Research, teaching, service, and citizenship will be taken into account (consistent with budgeted duties) in judging whether the candidate has fulfilled these requirements. The interpretation of these requirements, as they apply specifically to the Department of Physics and Astronomy, are listed below for an EFT of 0.50 Research and 0.25 Instruction. While it would be unrealistic to expect each candidate to rate excellent in each item below, substantial activity and achievement is expected overall.

A. Research and other Scholarly Activities

The general requirement is that "...Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as national authorities...". Publication in national or international refereed journals constitute a necessary, but not sufficient proof of such qualities. "Following a development period of 1-2 years, at least an average of 1-2 articles per year in high quality peer review journals is expected. Exceptional quality may be taken under consideration when taking into account the candidate's publication record."

Outside experts in the candidate's area of research will be contacted and will be asked to speak specifically to these points. A developing, vigorous research program is mandatory for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Additionally, outside grant support is expected for the candidate. See Section VI.B for a comprehensive outline of the factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's research accomplishments.

B. Teaching

Each candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate a record of effective teaching. It is expected that the candidate should demonstrate activities over and above merely adequate classroom instruction.

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 physics and/or astronomy 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 demonstrate that problems have been addressed and improvement has occurred by the time of Promotion and Tenure.

See Section [VI.A](#) for an outline of the factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

C. Service and Citizenship

Although research and teaching are considered the most important activities of a faculty member in the Department of Physics and Astronomy, it is expected that each candidate will serve the Department, College, University, and Physics or Astronomy communities in a responsive manner when called upon. See Sections [VI.C.](#) and [VI.D.](#) for an outline of the factors which will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's service and citizenship.

II. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Each candidate must satisfy the requirements set forth in the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (henceforth referred to as the Guidelines). Research, teaching, service, and citizenship will be taken into account (consistent with budgeted duties) in judging whether the candidate has fulfilled these requirements. The interpretation of these requirements, as they apply specifically to the Department of Physics and Astronomy, are listed below. While it would be unrealistic to expect each candidate to rate excellent in each item below, substantial activity and achievement is expected overall.

A. Research and other Scholarly Activities

The general requirement is that the candidate must be recognized as a national and/or international authority in his/her area. Publication in national or international refereed journals constitute a necessary, but not sufficient proof of such qualities. Productivity or quality should exceed that for promotion to associate professor and should be commensurate with researchers at this level in the subdiscipline as evinced by the external evaluators. Outside experts in the candidate's area of research will be contacted and will be asked to speak specifically to this point. A vigorous established research program is mandatory for promotion to the highest rank. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally or internationally competitive research grant or contract for which the candidate is either the principal investigator, the co-principal investigator, or co-investigator on a major collaboration, during the period since application for the last promotion. Other activities which are deemed appropriate in the determination of this recognition are as follows:

1. Invited talks at national and international meetings
2. Invited lectures at universities and research laboratories
3. Invited published papers or monographs
4. Special national or international awards or honors for research

See Section [VI.B](#) for a comprehensive outline of the factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's research accomplishments.

B. Teaching

Each candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate a record of effective teaching. It is expected that the candidate should demonstrate activities over and above merely adequate classroom instruction. Several ways to fulfill this requirement are listed in the [Guidelines](#). Additional

possible activities are listed below:

1. Publications in primarily teaching related refereed journals, such as the *American Journal of Physics*, etc.
2. Special lectures and talks which are oriented toward undergraduate or graduate teaching.
3. Coordination of special programs for students, including acquisition of grants for same, such as summer student research, etc.

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 physics and/or astronomy education; local, regional or national awards. A national reputation for excellence in teaching should also be apparent in letters from external assessors. See Section VI.A. for an outline of the factors that will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance.

C. Service and Citizenship

Although research and teaching are considered the most important activities of a faculty member in the Department of Physics and Astronomy, it is expected that each candidate will serve the Department, College, University, and Physics or Astronomy communities in a responsive manner when called upon. These activities include (but would not exclude others):

1. Service on Departmental, College, and University committees, governing boards, etc.
2. Activities related to student and professional visitations on campus
3. Activities related to special lecture series, local conferences, etc.
4. Service on advisory boards, etc., for national and international physics or astronomy related organizations and meetings.

See Sections VI.C and [VI.D](#). for an outline of the factors, which will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate's service and citizenship.

III. THE EVALUATION PROCESS

At any stage in this process the Head may meet individually with any member or members of the Tenured Faculty or Full Professors as appropriate (henceforth referred to as the Promotion Committee) or the candidate to discuss the candidacy. The candidate is free to withdraw his/her name from consideration at any stage in the process and/or the Promotion Committee may vote to terminate the process. In the latter case, the Committee will provide the candidate with a statement outlining the reasons for this decision.

- A. The Head will inform the Promotion Committee and will solicit written input from all faculty members of the Department. This written departmental input

may be characterized and/or summarized as appropriate with respect to its relevancy to deliberations of the Promotion Committee, approved as reflecting such by a two-thirds majority of the Committee, and then if appropriate, included as part of the Promotion Dossier that goes forward to the Dean.

- B. The candidate for promotion will be asked to provide the following documentation:
1. A complete, up-to-date *curriculum vitae* (cv).
 2. The "Recommendation for Promotion--Summary Information" document, Appendix D, of the [Guidelines](#).
 3. A thorough "Research Perspective" which provides an overview of the candidate's research history, areas of experience and expertise, and accomplishments.
 4. Since it is expected that the candidate will have established a national or international reputation in a specific area(s) of his or her research, the candidate should furnish a statement which includes the following:
 - a. identification of the specific area(s) upon which the request for promotion is based;
 - b. a list of particularly noteworthy publications since the last promotion. (Generally, three or four such representative publications should suffice unless the candidate deems it necessary to select a larger body of his/her work.) The publications on this list will be reviewed by members of the Departmental Promotion Committee;
 - c. supporting documentation explaining the significance of the publications on the list referenced in III.B.4.b. above. This documentation should include citation data, conference invitations, awards, or any other forms of recognition attributable to these publications which bespeak of the candidate's national and/or international research reputation.
- C. The candidate should be encouraged to furnish any other evidence for a national and/or international reputation beyond that which is evident from the documentation described in Section III.B.
- D. The Promotion Committee meets and reviews available material and discusses the candidacy. If the Promotion Committee decides to continue the process, it selects the Research and Teaching Subcommittees. (See Section [IV.](#))
- E. The Promotion Committee meets and evaluates the cv, student evaluation records, written Departmental input, the candidate's documentation (described in Sections III.B and III.C), and the reports of the two subcommittees according to the appropriate criteria cited in Section I. of this document. Details of this evaluation process are outlined in Section [IV.](#) of this document. The Promotion Committee then either recommends to the Head that he/she seek letters of reference from external peers, University colleagues, and

former students or that the process be terminated.

- F. The Head solicits letters from external peers according to the intent and procedures contained in the [Guidelines](#). Letters from University colleagues and former students may also be sought.
- G. The Promotion Committee meets and evaluates all materials according to the criteria cited in Section I. of this document. A final decision on the question of whether to recommend or not to recommend the candidate for promotion is reached. This is in the form of a written ballot as described in the [Guidelines](#). At this stage of the process, the Head must meet with the candidate to inform him/her of the status of the procedure.
- H. The Head prepares a cover letter in accordance with the specifications cited in Section [I](#) or [II](#). of this document as appropriate.
- I. The Promotion Committee meets and makes an overall administrative review of the Promotion Dossier that will be sent forward to the Dean. If one or more members wish to file a minority report and have it included in the Promotion Dossier, they must notify the Head more than 24 hours before this meeting of their intent to do so.
- J. If a minority report is presented to the Head within 72 hours after the meeting cited in Section [III.G](#). above, the Promotion Committee meets and makes an overall administrative review of the Promotion Dossier, including the minority report, that will be sent forward to the Dean. At this stage of the process, the Head must meet with the candidate to inform him/her of the status of the procedure; in addition, the candidate should be given the opportunity, in accordance with University policy, to review the entire dossier, except for the external letters, before it is submitted.
- K. After submission of a dossier, the Committee can be convened to take appropriate action on any additional information bearing on the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

IV. FORMATION OF AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING SUBCOMMITTEES

The Promotion Committee will select, in a manner appropriate to the individual case under consideration, two subcommittees to prepare reports to the committee on the research and teaching qualifications of the candidate. These subcommittees will perform the procedures outlined in this Section.

- A. The Research Subcommittee will consist of three members of the Promotion Committee, at least one of whom should have research interests not closely associated with that of the candidate. This subcommittee should carry out the following procedures:
 - 1. Collect and assemble all available information relating to the research accomplishments of the candidate.
 - 2. Select several (or all) of the publications from the list of representative

publications supplied by the candidate. These papers should be reviewed and citations should be checked to ascertain the importance and nature of the citation.

3. Prepare an in-depth report of their findings. This report, along with the candidate's written statements, cv, and any written faculty input, should be made available to all members of the Promotion Committee several days prior to the meeting called to discuss the nomination for promotion.
4. If the promotion procedure reaches the point of seeking letters from external peers, this Subcommittee should offer names of not more than six appropriate external peers for consideration by the Promotion Committee. (See Section [V.](#))

B. The Teaching Subcommittee will consist of two members of the Promotion Committee. This subcommittee should carry out the following procedures:

1. Collect and assemble all available information relating to the teaching effectiveness of the candidate.
2. Prepare an in-depth report of their findings. This report should be made available to all members of the Promotion Committee several days prior to the meeting called to discuss the nomination for promotion.
3. If the promotion procedure reaches the point of seeking letters from external peers, this Subcommittee may offer names of not more than six former students and University of Georgia colleagues for consideration by the Promotion Committee. Included with this list should be the details of the interaction between each student and the candidate.

V. PROCESS FOR THE SOLICITATION OF LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

If the promotion process passes step III.E. above, the following procedures will be used to obtain the a list of names of external peers and a list of names of former students and University of Georgia colleagues:

A. External Peers in the Candidate's Research Area

The Head should make clear to all contributors of possible names that the persons suggested should have expertise in the area(s) chosen by the candidate as the area(s) on which the promotion is to be based. It should also be made clear that University policy requires that all letters received must be included in the final Promotion Dossier. All names should include the following support information in writing: a professional biography including evidence of and extent of expertise in the area(s) for which the candidate is being considered for promotion, the extent of research collaboration with the candidate, and any other professional or personal ties to the candidate. The procedure for obtaining a list of possible external peers is:

1. The candidate may submit not more than six names.
2. Any member of the Promotion Committee may submit names.

3. The Research Subcommittee, as indicated in Section IV., will submit not more than six names.
4. The candidate may stipulate up to three specific persons be excluded as peers; a brief justification should accompany such a request.

From this list of names a final list is selected which is acceptable to both the Head and a 2/3 majority of the Promotion Committee. There must be at least four and at most seven letters solicited; of these, at least two of a total of four or five or three of a total of six or seven, must be from the candidate's list. Peer's who cannot or do not respond may be replaced maintaining the proper balance.

- B. Former Students and University of Georgia Colleagues
Letters soliciting input regarding teaching effectiveness may be sought. These may be either from former students or from internal or external peers. The procedure for obtaining such a list is:

1. The candidate may submit not more than six names.
2. Any member of the Promotion Committee may submit names.
3. The Teaching Subcommittee, as indicated in Section [III](#), may submit not more than six names.

From this list of names a final list is selected which is acceptable to both the Head and a 2/3 majority of the Promotion Committee.
The Head of the Department alone is responsible for soliciting all letters of reference.

VI. FACTORS FOR EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION

A. Teaching:

1. Classroom Teaching Experience
2. Online Teaching
3. Evaluation by Students
 - a. Solicited letters from former students
 - i. Thesis students
 - ii. Other students
 - b. Student evaluation forms
4. Evaluation by Peers
 - a. Examinations and student achievement
 - b. Class preparation
 - c. Quality of teaching
5. Student Advising and Supervision
 - a. Masters Candidates

- i. Major Professor
 - ii. Advisory Committee
 - iii. Reading Committee
 - b. Doctoral Candidates
 - i. Major Professor
 - ii. Advisory Committee
 - iii. Reading Committee
- 6. Examination Committees
 - a. Masters Candidates
 - b. Doctoral Candidates
 - i. Preliminary Examination Committee
 - ii. Final Examination Committee
- 7. Publications
 - a. Journals such as the American Journal of Physics
 - b. Textbooks
 - c. Laboratory Manuals
 - d. Lecture Notes
 - e. Other
- 8. Contributions to the Curriculum
 - a. Revision
 - b. Innovation
 - i. Implementing new pedagogies
 - ii. Creating service-learning courses
 - iii. Other
- 9. Contributions to Lecture Demonstrations
 - a. Design
 - b. Implementation
- 10. Contributions to Laboratory Experiments
 - a. Design
 - b. Implementation
- 11. Educational Software/Apps with Demonstrated Impact
- 12. Participation in Seminars and Colloquia
- 13. Grants Associated with Teaching

- a. Instructional for classroom lectures, *etc.*
- b. Instructional for equipment used in teaching, or for student self-help purposes (video, closed TV, *etc.*)
- c. Experimental methods, *etc.*
- d. Instructional grants for high school or undergraduate student science training programs, *etc.*
- e. Educational outreach as a portion of research grant
- f. Other

B. Research and other Scholarly Activities:

- 1. Research Perspective
 - a. Depth
 - b. Breadth
 - c. Coherence
 - d. Accomplishments
- 2. Publications (See Curriculum Vitae for detailed categorization)
 - a. Peer-reviewed publications
 - b. Non-peer-reviewed publications with demonstrated impact
- 3. Research Software/App Development with Demonstrated Impact
- 4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)
- 5. Peer Evaluation
 - a. Solicited letters from external Peers
 - b. Solicited letters from internal Peers when they exist
- 6. External Recognition
 - a. Invited lectures, seminars, colloquia, talks, webinars, *etc.*
 - b. Session chair, discussion leader, *etc.*
 - c. Honors, awards (fellowships, prizes, *etc.*)
 - d. Research support

C. Public Service:

- 1. Committees
- 2. Consulting
- 3. Outreach activities to schools/community
- 4. Public departmental events
- 5. Other

- D. Service to the Academy:
1. Department
 - a. Committees
 - b. Supervisory roles
 - c. Student advising
 - d. Recruiting and Visitation
 - i. High School
 - ii. College
 - e. Seminars
 - f. Special assignments
 2. College
 - a. Committees, leadership roles
 - b. Special assignments
 3. University
 - a. Committees, leadership roles
 - b. Special assignments
 4. Extramural
 - a. Committees, leadership roles
 - b. Consultation
 - c. Lectures
 - d. Peer review (papers, grants)
 - e. Other

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Physics and Astronomy, 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.