

Criteria for Promotion/Tenure¹: Department of Food Science and Technology

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Food Science and Technology will carefully adhere to the *University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* (hereafter, *Guidelines*). 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 Promotion and Tenure Unit (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 extent to which the candidate is required to meet research/instruction/extension criteria will be proportional to the candidate's appointment.

Acceptable documentation for meeting the criteria for research, extension and teaching is listed in the *Guidelines* handbook

The Department of Food and Science and Technology requires documentation of excellence in the primary focus area indicated by the letter provided to the candidate for promotion or tenure at the time of hiring. The letter of appointment will be a permanent part of the candidate's dossier. It will indicate a distribution of effort (equivalent full time, EFT) that explains how much time is expected to be devoted to research, teaching, Extension, service and/or administration. Satisfactory performance must also be documented in other areas for which EFT is assigned. For multiple author accomplishments (e.g., publications, grants, co-teaching, workshops, and/or speaking engagements) it is recommended that in the dossier each item be annotated as appropriate to indicate the candidate's contribution, percentage effort, and the involvement of students and/or post-doctoral associates. No matter what the primary focus may be, participation in faculty governance and service is expected unless exemptions have been received. If EFT has been reassigned after hiring, the date of the change and new distribution should be noted in the dossier.

Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

All procedures and policies shall follow *The Guidelines* and this document. The Department Head is responsible for ensuring that the letter of appointment is placed in the candidate's dossier, shall conduct the initial advisement concerning promotion and tenure, and arrange for a timely third year review. It is recommended that the Department Head secure tenured faculty to mentor and provide additional advice for each new candidate. The Department Head is responsible for helping candidates to develop their dossiers, for obtaining external letters of evaluation, and for organizing meetings of the faculty to discuss issues related to promotion and tenure of individual candidates.

Calendar for Promotion and Tenure

A suggested calendar:

- February-March – Department Head requests names of faculty who wish to be considered for promotion.

¹ Includes Post-Tenure Review Criteria

- April/May – Preliminary consideration is initiated (when required) based on a candidate’s curriculum vitae and statement of achievements
- May-June – The candidate’s dossier for external evaluation is completed and reviewed.
- June-July – Requests for letters of evaluation are prepared and mailed
- August – Submit completed dossier to the departmental head; Departmental vote
- Fall – Follow CAES and university deadlines

Research Accomplishments

The principal criteria for promotion should be the quality of the research contribution rather than quantity. The candidate should clearly indicate their role/contributions in the efforts.

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as a regional and national authority in the candidate’s field of study

1. Contribute innovative knowledge in the field of food science
2. Demonstrate effective leadership in developing a research program from initiation to completion of projects
3. Publish research in refereed scientific journals of national or international significance; Journals should be in the top 50% of those in food science-related or allied disciplines; Collaborate effectively with other scientists for enhancing creative endeavors through documentation of cooperative publications
4. Demonstrate success in obtaining sustainable extramural support for independent or collaborative research
5. Sources of funding include federal grants or contracts, foundation grants, or industry or state grants or contracts
6. An independent research program demonstrated by securing funded grant(s) or contract(s) as PI or Co-PI and/or Co-I on multiple grants, contracts, sub-contracts, or other awards as warranted by the discipline.
7. Receive national recognition of research accomplishments in the area of expertise within the Food Science discipline (e.g., awards, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to research, invitations to serve on funding review panels, editorial boards service, evidence of high impact articles, etc.)

Criteria for Tenure

1. All criteria listed above in this category.
2. Continue satisfying the needs of the department for the specific research expertise of the candidate.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence as being a regional and national authority in the candidate’s field of study

1. Demonstrate significant and innovative contributions to knowledge in the field of food science since promotion to Associate Professor
2. Provide successful leadership in collaborative research efforts
3. Publish research in refereed scientific journals of national or international significance; Journals should be in the top 50% of those in food science-related or allied disciplines; Collaborate effectively with other scientists for enhancing creative endeavors through documentation of cooperative publications
4. Demonstrate leadership of a developed, sustainable research program supported by external funding
 - a. Sources of funding include federal grants or contracts, foundation grants, or industry or state grants or contracts

- b. An independent research program demonstrated by 1 or more funded grants or contracts as PI OR Co-PI and/or Co-I on multiple grants, contracts, sub-contracts, or other awards as warranted by the discipline.
5. Receive recognition as a research leader at the national or international level. in the area of expertise within the Food Science discipline (e.g., awards, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to research, invitations to serve on funding review panels, service on editorial boards, evidence of high impact articles, etc.)

Extension/Outreach Accomplishments

The principal criteria for promotion should be the quality of the Extension contribution rather than quantity. The candidate should clearly indicate their role/contributions in the efforts.

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as a regional and national authority in the candidate's subject area

1. Demonstrate leadership and technical ability in developing innovative Food Science Extension programs that are based on industry and societal clientele needs related to Food Science
2. Establish specific educational expertise within the department relative to the individual's Food Science expertise;
3. Develop and update extension bulletins, fact-sheets, newsletters that address emerging needs of Georgia's food industry
4. Develop and coordinate high impact programming to include workshops or short courses in the area of the individual's area of expertise
5. Establish applied industry-related research programs in food science that contribute to a segment of Georgia food industry
6. Develop a niche of expertise that is recognized by the Georgia food industry and provides the candidate a solid academic reputation with that industry sector
7. The candidate must have achieved tangible results that create positive impact for a specific Georgia food industry
8. Receive state and regional recognition of emerging stature in extension programming and research application in the area of Food Science discipline (e.g., awards, invited presentations, manuscript review activities, recognitions within professional societies related to outreach, etc.)
9. Effective program development can be demonstrated through (a) presentation of issue identification, the results of needs assessment, outlined objectives, and description of how the program is compatible with unit and University missions; (b) description of selected activities and/or products in implementation that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to the program; (c) description of the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and implementation of the program; (d) identification of impact and public value, including identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries; and (e) peer evaluation. Both quantitative evidence (e.g. changes in test scores, increased production or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative evidence (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics, etc.) should be included.

Criteria for Tenure

1. All criteria listed above in this category.
2. Continue satisfying the needs of the department for the specific outreach expertise of the candidate.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence as being a regional and national authority in the candidate's subject area

1. Establish and sustain applied, industry-oriented outreach programs for a specific food industry sector with national or international stature; Provide documentation from industry clientele
2. Effective program development can be demonstrated through (a) presentation of issue identification, the results of needs assessment, outlined objectives, and description of how the program is compatible with unit and University missions; (b) description of selected activities and/or products in implementation that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to the program; (c) description of the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and implementation of the program; (d) identification of impact and public value, including identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries; and (e) peer evaluation. Both quantitative evidence (e.g. changes in test scores, increased production or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative evidence (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics, etc.) should be included.
3. Demonstrate outreach programs have achieved national and/or international recognition and will be maintained at this stature (e.g., awards, invited presentations, invitations to provide relevant programs in other states and regions, recognitions within professional societies related to outreach, invitations to serve on funding review panels, service on editorial boards, evidence of high impact articles, etc.)

Teaching Accomplishments

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature of becoming an effective teacher

1. Develop or significantly revise food-related courses including lectures, handouts, classroom activities, laboratories and student projects including service learning and internships
2. Implement innovations in teaching delivery and their dissemination including the use of electronic media
3. Engage undergraduate and graduate students in the learning process
4. Develop and implement a teaching philosophy appropriate to the course(s)
5. Develop a teaching portfolio that documents the instructor's teaching style, approach as well as his or her improvement in response to student evaluations, peer evaluations and self-evaluations of teaching, as well as the connection between the courses taught by the instructor and other courses taught in the department. The portfolio should demonstrate effectiveness in conveying core concepts and ensuring that learning outcomes are achieved in assigned courses and enthusiasm for the subject matter. Effective advising and mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students should be documented.
6. Promote undergraduate and graduate student professional development
7. Participate in the recruitment and retention of Food Science students
8. Effectively advise and mentor Food Science students in course work, meeting degree requirements, and undergraduate and graduate research

Criteria for Tenure

1. All criteria listed above in this category.
2. Continue satisfying the needs of the department for the specific teaching expertise of the candidate

Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence as being an effective teacher

1. The same as for promotion to Associate Professor
2. Participate in professional society activities related to the improvement of Food Science education (e.g., participation in societies that serve teaching missions within food disciplines)
3. Demonstrate achievement and leadership in instructional activities such as contributing significantly to program review and improvement and mentoring and advising junior faculty with teaching appointments

Service to Society, Professional Groups and the University/College/Department/Center
Criteria for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor that must be satisfied to provide clear and convincing evidence of professional service

1. Faculty members should provide service to local, state, national or international food-related organizations; Examples could include participation in a food-related community project, invited presentations at the community or state level related to the candidate's expertise, contribute food-related public policy development
2. Faculty members should provide service to their professional organizations; Examples include serving as a manuscript reviewer for professional journals, abstract reviewer for professional conferences, grant panel reviewer, and/or committee membership for a professional organization.
3. Faculty members should be active participants in service to the university/college/department/center; Faculty should serve on at least 3 committees at the departmental, college, university or center level for each promotion

Annual Evaluations and Third Year Review

The processes and procedures for Annual Evaluations and Third-Year Reviews of candidates follow the university guidelines as stated in the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* document.

Procedures for Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

Purpose - The purpose of the review will be to examine, recognize, develop and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members at the University of Georgia.

Procedures -

1. Conditions of Review Process - Reviews shall occur once every five years after tenure or promotion has been granted unless delayed because the faculty member is on leave; or because his or her review for promotion to professor is approved by the faculty of the promotion/tenure unit for the following year. These reviews can be combined with nomination reviews for UGA chaired/distinguished professorships. In the case of combined reviews, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the criteria of C.1 below.
2. Selection of Review Committee - The departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee will be selected by drawing three names by lottery from a pool containing all tenured faculty in the Department of Food Science and Technology by the Graduate Coordinator of the department in the presence of the faculty members to be reviewed. It is possible to conduct the drawing over the telephone, but a staff member will be present to witness the drawing. If a name drawn is rejected by the faculty member being reviewed (up to a maximum of 5 rejections), another name shall be drawn until 3 names have been selected. All names will be returned to

the pool before the lottery for the next faculty to be reviewed is conducted. The members of each Committee will select their Committee Chairperson.

3. Information to be Considered by the Post-Tenure Review Committee–
 - a. The Review Committee will evaluate the qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member’s performance over at least the previous five-year period. The evidence should include annual reviews by the promotion/tenure unit head, a current curriculum vitae, materials providing documentation of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the peer-review committee or the faculty member judge to be relevant to the review. The faculty member should provide the Post-Tenure Review Committee with a concise summary of accomplishments and future plans not to exceed two pages in length.
 - b. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the Department of Food Science and Technology and the University is optional, but will be done if either the Post Tenure Review Committee or the faculty member so desire.
 - c. The faculty member's contributions to interdisciplinary programs, governance, administration and other programs outside the Department of Food Science and Technology will be given appropriate consideration.
4. Report of the Committee
 - a. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will provide the faculty member with a concise, written summary of the review and a conclusion as to whether his/her performance is deemed satisfactory. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. If the faculty member's performance is deemed not satisfactory, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will provide a report identifying the areas of weakness and suggest actions that might strengthen the faculty member’s performance.
 - b. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology will also maintain in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.
 - c. The faculty member may request reconsideration of the post-tenure review recommendation of the Post-Tenure Review Committee by submitting a letter and additional documentation to the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology.
5. Reconsideration Process – A faculty member may appeal in writing a Post-Tenure Review Committee action or decision within fifteen days of the final action of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The appeal will go to the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee. The Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee will be a seven-member faculty committee elected by the University Council for two-year staggered terms. The Executive Committee of the University Council will nominate faculty members at the rank of professor with tenure from within and outside the University Council as candidates for election to the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee.

Accountability

1. Copies of these procedures will be filed with the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.
2. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology will maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
3. At the end of each academic year, the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental

Sciences will receive a report from the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews.

4. The Department of Food Science and Technology procedures for Post Tenure review will be reviewed at any time that five tenured faculty members of the department request such a review.

Procedures to Address Unsatisfactory Performance

1. If a faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory in the review, once all requests for reconsideration and appeals have been exhausted, the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology, the faculty member and the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will prepare a formal plan of faculty development.
2. The faculty development plan will be approved by the majority of the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Committee.
3. The plan will contain the following:
 - a. Specific goals or outcomes to be achieved
 - b. Activities that should be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes
 - c. Time lines within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished
 - d. Criteria by which the faculty member can monitor progress
4. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology will be responsible for forwarding the formal faculty development plan to the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.
5. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology, the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the appropriate vice president will be jointly responsible for arranging suitable resources for the development plan, if desired.
6. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology will meet with each faculty member whose performance was deemed unsatisfactory at the time of the annual evaluation to review progress toward achieving the goals or outcomes of the development plan. A progress report which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Science.
7. At the end of the prescribed time (3-years), the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology, a Review Committee selected by the process defined in Section 2b and preferably including at least one of the faculty member's original Post-Tenure Review Committee members, will determine if the faculty member has successfully completed the development plan. The Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology will report to the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences the findings of the third year review.
8. Perceived Unfair Annual Reviews
 - a. If the faculty member perceives that the Head of the Department of Food Science and Technology's annual review of progress in completion of the development plan is unfair, he or she may provide a written response to the Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and request his or her review. The Dean may concur with the Department Head's review or conduct another review which may include input from the faculty member's Department of Food Science and Technology Post Tenure Review Committee.
 - b. The Department of Food Science and Technology Post-Tenure Committee will not be involved in this process.
 - c. Any additional review shall follow The University of Georgia's grievance procedures.

Implementation

1. Faculty selected for review in each cycle will be those who have the longest period since their last promotion or tenure decision.

2. The Dean of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences will serve the role of the Food Science and Technology Department Head for the Post-Tenure Review of the Food Science and Technology Department Head and any follow up reviews if required.

Approval of PTU Document

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Food Science and Technology and must be reviewed and approved by the CAES Dean 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.

These procedures and criteria will apply to all faculty in the PTU in the annual cycle of promotion and tenure from the approved date forward.

Original approved by the Faculty on July 22, 2015

Revision approved by the Faculty on January 20, 2017

Revision approved by the Dean on August 29, 2017

Revision approved by the Provost on February 21, 2018