

University of Georgia
Department of Plant Biology
Bylaws

Appendix I – Promotion and Tenure Advise ment and Criteria

Approved by the Faculty, January 27, 2016, Approved by the Dean, March 23, 2016, Approved by the Provost, March 28, 2016

Revision approved by the Faculty on January 18, 2017

Revision approved by the Dean on January 30, 2017

Revision approved by the Provost on January 30, 2017

The revised PTU document approved on January 30, 2017 by the Provost will apply to all faculty from this date forward. This revised PTU document supersedes all previous revisions.

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

For formal promotion and tenure votes, University Guidelines specify that quorum consists of at least two-thirds of the faculty members eligible to vote on a given candidate.

A. PRE-TENURE/PROMOTION EVALUATION PROCESS

At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document and the *Guidelines* to advise him or her about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure. The new faculty member will sign a letter indicating receipt of this information.

I. Annual Spring Semester Review of Progress:

In addition to the reviews for promotion and tenure that are mandated by the University and by the College, the Plant Biology Department will conduct an annual review of progress towards promotion and/or tenure in the following manner:

1. Assistant and Associate Professors, Assistant and Associate Research Scientists, Academic Professional Associates and Academic Professionals will prepare dossiers indicating their progress. These dossiers will document what has been accomplished in the last year, what has been accomplished since hiring or the last promotion, and what has been accomplished in one's entire career. The Department Head will explain the desired format, which is similar to an actual promotion dossier, using previously prepared dossiers as examples.

2. Associate and Full Professors will meet to review the progress of Assistant Professors, Assistant Research Scientists, and Academic Professional Associates.
3. Full Professors will meet to review the progress of Associate Professors, Associate Research Scientists, and Academic Professionals.
4. The faculty member being reviewed will receive a letter from the Department Head summarizing comments made at the annual review. At least one other member of the reviewing faculty will examine a draft of the summary letter and make suggestions to ensure the letter is consistent with the discussion at the review meeting. The faculty member being reviewed may discuss the summary letter with the Department Head.

This review will normally occur in Spring Semester of every year. The departmental annual review of progress need not be conducted in the Spring Semester of an academic year when promotion or tenure for the faculty member was approved by the Department during the preceding Fall Semester.

The terms senior or reviewing faculty for a given rank are used in this document as defined in points 2 and 3 above.

II. Peer Evaluation of Instruction:

Assistant Professors will be given a mentoring or formative instructional evaluation during one of their early teaching efforts. A senior faculty, selected jointly by the Assistant Professor and the Department Head, will attend a representative fraction of the classes for one course. The mentoring faculty may make helpful comments and suggestions to the Assistant Professor at any time during the semester. At the end of the semester, the mentoring faculty will write a letter to the Department Head summarizing the observations and suggestions made. This letter may be discussed in the annual Spring Semester review by senior faculty, but would not become a part of a promotion dossier.

Assistant and Associate Professors will be evaluated at least once by the more formal peer evaluation committee of the Department. This will consist of at least three senior faculty attending at least three lectures or class sessions each. The committee members will score various aspects of instructional skills and success, and summarize their evaluation in a formal written report at the end of the semester. The faculty member being evaluated has the opportunity to discuss the report with the committee, and to suggest possible changes. The chair of the evaluating committee turns in the final report to the Department Head. This report is used as part of promotion dossiers.

III. Additional Mentoring:

Assistant professors may request that the Department Head identify a senior faculty mentor or mentors to provide advice on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion and tenure, as an additional source of guidance.

IV. Third-year review:

The third-year review is a thorough, formative review of progress mandated by the University and College. In the spring of the third year each assistant professor will submit a dossier similar

to those prepared for the annual Spring reviews. The Department Head or other senior faculty mentor may advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and help ensure its accuracy. 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 Department Head will appoint a committee of at least three faculty to review the faculty member's dossier and performance. Faculty from other departments may be members of this committee. The committee will review all aspects of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier, and will present their evaluations to the rest of the faculty at the annual Spring review. This will be followed by a general discussion.

The reviewing faculty will then vote on the following question: "[Name] has made sufficient progress towards [promotion to the next rank and/or tenure]." 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." If a candidate does not receive a majority of "Yes" votes on continuation, the Department will not renew the candidate's contract at the next opportunity to do so. A quorum of the department's senior faculty must participate in these votes.

The Department Head will summarize the results of the vote, the discussion, and the findings of the third year review committee in a letter to the faculty member being reviewed. The Department Head will consult members of the review committee to ensure the text of the letter accurately reflects their evaluations and the general discussion. The letter is then given to the person being reviewed and its contents discussed with the Department Head.

The faculty member being reviewed may then write a response letter, addressed to the Department Head. Both the third-year review letter from the Department Head, and the response letter, will be sent to the Dean of the College, and a copy maintained in the Department's faculty personnel files.

V. Preliminary Consideration:

The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the *Guidelines*. Prior to the annual spring reviews, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will communicate this in writing to the Department Head. As part of the Spring review process, the senior faculty will then vote on whether outside letters of evaluation should be solicited for the candidate, in preparation for a final consideration, or formal review, vote to be held early in Fall semester. Following the vote on each candidate the Department Head will announce how he/she voted. The results will be conveyed by the Department Head in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote.

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 Department Head or an appointed senior mentor to prepare the dossier. If the Department Head voted "No" then an appointed senior faculty who voted "Yes" must be in charge of soliciting the outside letters of evaluation and preparing the dossier for the departmental formal review.

VI. Final Consideration (Formal Review):

In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the *Guidelines*. The candidate and the Department Head (or appointed senior faculty) will prepare a dossier for the formal review to be made available to the senior faculty for their consideration; this should be completed and available to the senior faculty no later than the first day of classes of Fall semester. The dossier will include an updated Curriculum vitae, an achievements section specified by the *Guidelines*, and the external letters of evaluation. The candidate may help prepare and review all parts of the dossier except for the external letters. The senior faculty will then meet to discuss the credentials and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote on each candidate the Department Head will announce how he/she voted. If the Department Head voted "No" then an appointed senior faculty who voted "Yes" must be in charge of preparing the dossier for the next level review committee.

In accordance with the "Principle of Flow" called for in the *Guidelines*, after a Formal Review vote, a candidate's promotion and/or tenure dossier will move forward to the next level of review regardless of whether the lower-level recommendation was positive or negative, except that the candidate may terminate the process at any time.

As a reminder, the University's requirements for rank are as follows:

Assistant Professor:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Candidates do not need a minimum number of years in a lower rank unless the initial appointment was at the instructor level at the University of Georgia.

Associate Professor:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Under usual circumstances, candidates must serve at least four years as assistant professor, including the year when the promotion will be considered at the University level, before they are eligible for promotion to associate professor.

Professor:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Under usual circumstances, candidates must serve at least five years as associate professor, including the year when the promotion will be considered at the University level, before they are eligible for promotion to professor.

B. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION:

All faculty in the Plant Biology Department are expected to actively participate in (i) academic research and scholarship, (ii) instruction at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and (iii) committee work and similar Departmental and University citizenship obligations. Service, as defined in the University's budgeted EFT distribution, is different than the committee work and other obligations often referred to as service to the department, to the University, or to one's discipline. Most faculty in Plant Biology have zero EFT budgeted for formal Service, and hence would not be evaluated on this, but all will be expected to contribute to appropriate committee

work and other similar obligations.

The balance between budgeted Research, Teaching, and formal Service accomplishments will be considered with respect to the candidate's EFT distribution and work assignments. Each candidate for promotion will have a unique mix of accomplishments.

I. Research

1. Publications:

1.1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and Tenure

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly in research - For promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and for tenure, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to establish a national reputation in their field.

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly in instruction – For promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and for tenure, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to provide evidence of an emerging national reputation for excellence in teaching and creative scholarship in the pedagogy of Biology instruction and/or in their field of basic research.

For candidates with an appointment that is predominantly formal service EFT as Herbarium Curator – For promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and for tenure, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to provide evidence of an emerging national reputation in their field of basic research or the effectiveness or best practices of herbarium curation.

1.2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly in research - For promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to establish an international reputation in their field; additionally, the research results of a candidate for full professor should give the sense of having answered a significant research question, or having achieved an alternative objective of comparable significance.

For candidates with appointments that are predominantly in instruction – For promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to establish a national reputation for excellence in teaching and creative scholarship in the pedagogy of Biology instruction and/or in their field of basic research.

For candidates with an appointment that is predominantly formal service EFT as Herbarium Curator – For promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must have published a body of work carried out at the University of Georgia sufficient to provide evidence

of a national reputation in their field of basic research or the effectiveness or best practices of herbarium curation.

For all candidates, publications generally are expected to appear in appropriate peer-reviewed journals that enjoy high national and international status. An issued United States Patent counts as a publication. Information deposited in national databases or distributed on the web may count as a publication, if these are equivalent in impact to a standard peer-reviewed publication.

2. Funding:

2.1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and Tenure

For promotion from assistant professor to associate professor the candidate is expected to establish an independent research program and to have aggressively sought external funding. External funding is expected to be proportionate to EFT assignment in research and the cost of research in the candidate's field. 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 graduate students and/or training of postdoctoral scholars.

2.2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

For promotion from associate professor to full professor, a record of grant funding as an associate professor is required for faculty with a majority appointment in research. For other faculty, evidence to have aggressively sought funding is required. External funding is expected to be proportionate to EFT assignment in research and the cost of research in the candidate's field. 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 graduate students and/or training of postdoctoral scholars.

3. Largely Collaborative Research:

For individuals whose research publications and funding are largely in collaborative research projects, the candidate's role must be explained and documented. The candidate should present evidence that she or he has played a major creative role in the conception, implementation and publication of the research.

4. Additional indicators of research productivity and recognition:

- i. Awards or other recognitions;
- ii. Invitations to review manuscripts;
- iii. Invitations to present research at conferences or other institutions;
- iv. Invitations to contribute chapters to books that are rigorously reviewed and widely distributed;
- v. Placement of graduate students and postdoctoral associates in advanced positions;
- vi. Organization or chairing conference sessions or conferences;
- vii. Service on grant panels or editorial boards;
- viii. Service to one's discipline or professional societies.

These activities can be an indication of a national or international reputation, and they can also

help establish such a reputation particularly with possible external evaluators for promotion letters. Candidates for promotion are expected to participate in a reasonable number of service activities related to one's discipline, and to have presented their research at appropriate conferences or institutions.

II. Teaching

All candidates for promotion should have demonstrated excellence and effectiveness in teaching that is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Evidence of teaching excellence and effectiveness can consist of outcomes from a combination of the following assessments:

- i. Peer teaching evaluations;
- ii. Student evaluations;
- iii. Receiving teaching awards;
- iv. Innovation in teaching methods;
- v. Creation of new courses that meet the needs of the Department or University;
- vi. Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral scholars in one's research laboratory.

Significant participation in approved efforts in K-12 teacher preparation and in K-12 school improvement efforts will be viewed as a favorable addition to one's instructional obligations.

Examples of evidence for this participation can include:

- Evidence that the faculty member designs and implements a research agenda in at least one area of need recognized by the public schools.
- Evidence that the faculty member assesses the impact of the engagement.
- Evidence that the faculty member disseminates for peer review the results of the outreach.
- Improving the candidate's own teaching so as to model effective teaching practices in courses taken by prospective teachers.
- Collaborating with public schools to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning.

On-line courses, web sites, and other online education activities will also be considered, but such teaching activities must be created in a manner that their effectiveness and impact can be assessed by the department.

All 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.

III. Service

For candidates with appointments that are predominately in formal service as Herbarium Curator - Indications of an active, well-funded, and well-curated facility include:

- Curation: proper maintenance of collections and appropriate collections growth
- Supervision: technical staff and students.
- Professionalism: involvement with herbaria/collections groups/societies at state to international levels.

- Grant support for: facility infrastructure, collections growth, collections-related projects, staff worker support.
- Education/training programs incorporating facility: providing opportunities/mentoring at undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Web presence: databases, images, information on plants.
- Public outreach activities/programs: plant identification/information request fulfillment; tours, presentations/workshops, participation in other programs for amateurs/general public.

IV. Citizenship – Committee Work and Similar Contributions

Candidates for promotion should have contributed to Department and University governance by serving on appropriate committees or performing similar service activities. Since Assistant Professors are normally assigned relatively light committee work loads, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will typically have less of these activities than a candidate for promotion to full Professor.

V. External Letters

Letters from external evaluators are crucial to the promotion and tenure process; they provide a critical assessment of whether the candidate has established a good national or international reputation. The evaluators should normally be full professors, or the equivalent, at other institutions, and will frequently include members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and other leaders in the candidate's discipline. A promotion dossier will include documentation that a reviewer is appropriately qualified to evaluate the candidate.

C. PROCEDURE FOR REVISIONS AND/OR UPDATES TO THIS PTU DOCUMENT

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

I received a copy of the Plant Biology Department's Promotion and Tenure Advisement and Criteria document.

Signature

Date