

Department of Genetics Promotion/Tenure Procedures & Criteria

The following guidelines and criteria provide information on how promotion and tenure shall be handled in the Department of Genetics, and on the criteria approved by this faculty for promotion and for tenure. In all matters related to third-year review and promotion and tenure, the unit will follow and adhere to the latest online iteration of the *University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (hereafter referred to the APT Guidelines)* and the *Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Lecturers (hereafter referred to as Lecturer Guidelines)*. The Department does not have a unit-level policy for the appointment and promotion of research scientists, and adheres to the *University of Georgia Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Scientists*. All current UGA policy documents are available here: <https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure/>

These unit-specific guidelines and criteria provide specific information on how third-year review and promotion and tenure will be handled in the unit. All relevant information relating to standards, criteria, and procedures for evaluating faculty performance for the purposes of Third-year Reviews and promotion and tenure in Genetics is included in this document and no other document exists. Information relating to Annual Evaluation is in a separate document.

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Genetics will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia *APT Guidelines* and *Lecturer Guidelines*. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend *APT Guidelines* and *Lecturer Guidelines*. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this document and the relevant University Guidelines. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the relevant University Guidelines will supersede this document.

Faculty in the Department of Genetics typically have appointments detailing the percent effort in research/scholarship, teaching, and potentially service. Regardless of whether percent effort is dedicated to service, all faculty are expected to contribute to service to the Department, as well as service appropriate for their position and career stage to the University, their profession, and society.

Formal votes require a quorum of the faculty of appropriate rank (see *APT Guidelines & Lecturer Guidelines*) be present. As per University rules, absentee ballots are permitted but do not count toward a quorum.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Genetics, 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 relevant University Guidelines. In addition, the faculty, dean and the Provost, must approve any changes or updates to this PTU document. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

Advisement

At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document and will be advised in writing about the Department's requirements for promotion and tenure.

For new faculty appointed at the beginning of spring semester, the memorandum of understanding associated with the initial letter of appointment will clearly specify when the tenure or promotion “clock” begins.

For Assistant Professors, Lecturers, and Associate Professors appointed without tenure, the Head will appoint a mentoring committee consisting of three faculty members of higher rank. This may include senior faculty on the same or different tracks. The head will ask one member to serve as the chair of the committee. The role of the committee is to advise the newly appointed member on matters relevant to their position, including teaching, research, professional decorum, the Department, promotion, and tenure. The appointed committee members serve as mentors who have agreed to provide advice when asked and to informally follow the progress and accomplishments of the Assistant Professor or Lecturer. At minimum, the chair of the mentoring committee will meet with the faculty member in person twice per year to discuss progress and challenges and will commit to responding to email questions from their advisee in a timely manner. The members of the committee can be recommended by the advisee or the Chair. The committee may include faculty from other units contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve. This does not preclude informal mentoring from others.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Related to Promotion

All faculty will have their teaching periodically observed and evaluated. These evaluations provide evidence that allows the Department to recognize and reward teaching, provide faculty with constructive feedback about teaching strengths and ideas for improvement, and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness for review dossiers, as described in Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 23. Evaluations will be performed by a minimum of two members of the Teaching Mentoring Committee, which is appointed by the Head of Department. The Teaching Mentoring Committee includes only faculty who have been promoted at least once, and can include any senior faculty with teaching responsibilities (e.g., Associate Professors, Professors, Senior Lecturers, etc.). Ahead of a peer evaluation, faculty can exclude up to two members of the Teaching Mentoring Committee from serving as an evaluator of their teaching without explanation. Evaluators for each faculty member will be determined by considering the course content, level, and format, as well as the personnel available, to maximize the utility of the feedback that evaluators provide. Peer evaluation of teaching will include in-person observations of classroom teaching, review of course materials, and discussions between the instructor and observers, using established departmental processes. Collectively, the evaluators will attend at least two class periods and will provide verbal and written feedback to the instructor.

All new faculty will be observed and receive formative feedback within their first year of teaching. The outcomes of this formative observation will be provided only to the observed faculty member. If the observed faculty member chooses to do so, some or all of this report may be used in third-year review and promotion/tenure dossiers to show evidence of teaching improvement.

All Assistant Professors and Lecturers will be observed in their third year and prior to consideration for promotion and tenure, and all Associate Professors and Senior Lecturers will be observed prior to consideration for promotion. Faculty appointed with credit toward

promotion and tenure will be observed at least once prior to consideration, with an option for two evaluations. Faculty will receive verbal and written feedback from evaluators and a report will be submitted to the Head of Department. These reports will be used for consideration during the observed faculty member's third-year review and during discussion of the observed faculty member's promotion and/or tenure by the Department. The peer evaluation of teaching reports will be available to all voting eligible faculty. Candidates can include excerpts from the report in their dossier as desired. It is strongly recommended that candidates include the overall summary from the report in their dossier.

Post-tenure review will also include peer evaluation of teaching. The post-tenure review committee will receive the peer observation report and will include the overview statement in the final post-tenure review evaluation letter.

Procedure for Third Year Review of Assistant Professors and Lecturers

Assistant Professors and Lecturers should receive a Third Year Review intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. This review will be a thorough, formative review of the Assistant professor's/Lecturer's progress mandated by the University.

Third year reviews shall be conducted by a third-year review committee that shall consist of a minimum of three faculty members who are eligible to vote, whose members are familiar with the unique roles and responsibilities of the position of the faculty being reviewed. The Head of the Department will appoint the committee, which can include members of the mentoring committee previously assigned by the Department. The candidate can exclude any faculty member from serving on their third-year review committee without providing a rationale. Reasonable effort should be made to include at least one Lecturer at the same or higher rank on a third-year review committee for a Lecturer. The committee may include faculty from other units contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve.

Third-year review candidates will submit a dossier to their Head of Department in the spring of their 3rd year. The Head of Department will supply this dossier to the Chair of the third-year review committee, along with the excerpted list of responsibilities and expectations as specified in the Offer Letter and any relevant addendums to the Offer Letter covering the period under consideration (reflecting allocation of effort). The Head of Department or an assigned faculty mentor will advise the faculty member under review on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

A Lecturer candidate will submit a dossier in alignment with the Lecturer Guidelines.

An Assistant Professor candidate will submit a dossier in alignment with the Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

The committee will review the provided materials with careful consideration of the promotion criteria that the candidate will be expected to meet at their next promotion. This committee will review publications and works in progress, efforts to secure external funding appropriate to their appointment, and other evidence of potential for meeting promotion expectations for research. The committee will also review student evaluations of teaching, the 3rd year review teaching observation report, teaching self-reflections, and other evidence of potential for meeting promotion expectations for teaching. On the basis of this

review, the committee will write a report that presents its findings in detail and that makes clear recommendations to the candidate concerning his or her progress towards promotion. In particular, the report will address the question of whether the candidate is progressing in a satisfactory way towards meeting departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure, as appropriate for their position.

A copy of the report will be given to both the candidate being evaluated and the Head of the Department. The faculty being evaluated also has the right to meet with the Head of the Department and the committee members individually or collectively to discuss the contents of the report. If desired, the candidate may 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.

The third-year review committee will report its findings to the Department at a regularly scheduled departmental meeting in the spring semester. The eligible faculty, including the Head of Department, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and reappointment is sufficient. Specifically, the faculty will vote on the following question: “[Candidate’s name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion to [the next rank].” Faculty will vote “yes” or “no” by ballot.

If the candidate does not receive a majority of "yes" votes, the faculty will then discuss and vote on whether to recommend continuation. If the vote is not to continue, the faculty will recommend that the candidate's contract not be renewed at the first opportunity to do so. A quorum (the *Guidelines* define eligible faculty and quorum) should be present for this vote. The Head of Department is not obligated to reveal their vote.

On the basis of the departmental vote, the Head of Department will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding their progress toward promotion and/or reappointment. The faculty member may reply in writing to the report within 10 working days and any reply becomes part of the report. Within 5 working days from the faculty member’s reply, the Head of Department will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the third-year review made because of the faculty member’s written reply. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.

In any year, a department head/dean may determine not to extend a contract to a nontenured faculty member. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the head following a discussion among voting eligible faculty, such as during a 3rd year review or consideration for promotion, consistent with the Department and the Department’s written criteria. Timely notice must be given to the faculty member per University of Georgia and Board of Regents Policies on Notice of Employment.

Preliminary Consideration for promotion of Lecturers & Tenure-Track Faculty

Preliminary consideration is a required step towards promotion, although the outcome of the preliminary consideration is advisory to the candidate, rather than binding. Under normal circumstances, in the fall semester of a candidate’s year of eligibility for preliminary consideration, the unit head should notify the candidate that they are eligible for preliminary consideration that semester. The purpose of preliminary consideration is to organize the candidate’s dossier, to provide an assessment of progress toward promotion, and to initiate the

process of soliciting external evaluations, as appropriate for the position. Candidates will submit their materials to the Department by March 15. Tenure-track faculty under consideration for tenure or for promotion to full professor are required to provide a research seminar in the semester of preliminary consideration or the prior semester.

A Lecturer candidate will submit a dossier in alignment with the *Lecturer Guidelines*.

An Assistant Professor candidate will submit a CV and a summary of teaching and research accomplishments (2-12 pages). This has to be in the format of dossier sections 4 & 5 (Appendix C in *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion & Tenure*).

For all candidates, the dossier will include the allocation of effort and initial teaching responsibilities, as well as any adjustments to work responsibilities made during the review period.

In the spring semester, the unit head will convene a quorum (at least two-thirds) of the eligible voting faculty of the appointment/promotion unit to indicate if they think the candidate warrants further consideration for promotion. After reviewing and discussing the preliminary dossier, the eligible faculty will vote by secret ballot. Within three days of the vote, the unit head or their designee must notify the candidate in writing of the eligible faculty's recommendation. The candidate may decide to proceed with, or defer, their application for promotion at this point in time.

Following the vote and in accordance with the *APT Guidelines & Lecturer Guidelines*, the Head of the Department will work with the candidate to prepare the dossier and solicit external letters of evaluation. If the candidate has one or more additional years of eligibility, they can request to defer consideration to the following year.

External Letters of Evaluation

The purpose of external letters of evaluation is to provide the Department with independent expert assessment of the quality and impact beyond UGA of work produced by the candidate. External reviewers should hold an equal or higher rank than the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion or their equivalent and should be recognized experts with national or international reputations in the candidate's field of study and scholarship. External reviewers should be able to objectively evaluate the candidate's contribution. Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors, former students, colleagues with whom the candidate has collaborated in the past seven years, or personal friends. Promotion dossiers will document that each referee is qualified to provide a fair and honest appraisal of the candidate's accomplishments and/or impact. The *APT Guidelines* describes the procedures and policies for selecting letter writers.

External letters of evaluation will be solicited for all tenure-track faculty. In alignment with *APT guidelines*, the minimum number of external letters for tenure-track faculty is four. For lecturer-track faculty, letters from outside UGA-will only be solicited if the candidate indicates that they have invested considerably in products with intended impacts beyond the University of Georgia.

Formal Review

In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the Department will follow the *APT Guidelines* and *Lecturer Guidelines*. The candidate will prepare the dossier for formal review, with feedback from the Head of Department or appointed senior faculty, as desired. The Head of Department will make the dossier available for evaluation by faculty members eligible to vote. The dossier should be made available no later than the first day of August, for consideration at the first faculty meeting in the fall (i.e., August).

The dossier for tenure-track faculty will include an updated *Curriculum vita*, external letters of evaluation, and an achievements section, as specified by the *APT Guidelines*.

The dossier for lecturer-track faculty will include an updated Curriculum vita, a statement of major accomplishments, a teaching portfolio, these Unit Guidelines, external letters of evaluation (if requested) and the Offer letter, as specified by the *Lecturer Guidelines*.

Voting-eligible faculty (as defined in *APT Guidelines* and *Lecturer Guidelines*) will then meet to discuss the candidate's credentials and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote in accordance with the *APT Guidelines* or *Lecturer Guidelines*, the Head of the Department will indicate how he/she voted. If the departmental vote was "yes" (by simple majority), the Head of the Department can work with the candidate to prepare the final dossier and cover letter. If the Head of the Department voted against the promotion, then the candidate may designate a senior faculty member from the Department to substitute for the Head. Regardless of the Head of Department's vote, they will summarize the deliberation for the Department's negative vote as a separate document in the dossier.

In accordance with the Principle of Flow in the *Guidelines*, the candidate's promotion and/or tenure dossier will pass to the next level of review independent of whether the department-level recommendation was positive or negative. The candidate may terminate the process at any time.

Criteria For Tenure and for Promotion

Overall Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor

Tenure-track Genetics faculty are expected to participate actively in academic research and scholarship, graduate and undergraduate instruction, and service to the Department, University, profession, and society. Genetics faculty are not all budgeted for formal service, but all are expected to function in a professional and timely manner in their committee work and other responsibilities.

The University's Guidelines state the following criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor at the University of Georgia:

Associate Professor: "Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional and national authorities."

Professor: "Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature."

Overall Expectations for Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer

The primary responsibility of Lecturer track Genetics Faculty is classroom instruction. Contributions related to service, research, and administrative responsibilities are expected only for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Principal Lecturers whose Offer Letter (or addendums to their Offer Letter) reflect such responsibilities and expectations in their allocation of effort. The Head of Department should indicate if the above activities were expected of the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Principal Lecturer as part of their annual evaluations.

The Department has developed discipline-specific criteria that, if met, will allow the candidate to meet or exceed the University's requirement for rank.

Research/Scholarship

With respect to scholarly research in Genetics, the primary criterion to be used for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure is evidence that the candidate can develop a sustainable research program while at the University of Georgia. Sustainability includes a regular pattern of dissemination of research to the community appropriate for their field of study. It also includes evidence of the ability to attract sufficient extramural funding to allow for the training of graduate students if a member of the graduate faculty, and/or postdoctoral scholars, and to allow these students and the candidate to pursue academic research in their area of study. The Department recognizes that the quantity of funding required may vary among sub-disciplines of Genetics. Evidence of the ability to fulfill graduate and/or postdoctoral training requires that there be sufficient funding to cover the stipends or wages of trainees as well as the costs of equipment and consumables for their research.

Promotion to Professor requires clear and convincing evidence of a sustained research program, both in research and training activities. Evidence of a sustained reputation is expected for promotion to Professor, as appropriate for the field of study. Evidence of a sustained reputation may include, but is not limited to: publications and citations; research collaborations and networks; generation and sharing of data and/or resources (e.g., reagents, resources, tools, code/software); awards and other honors; invited seminars, plenaries, or workshops; substantial media audiences for blogs, social media, podcasts, TV, radio, internet outlets; and research leadership roles (e.g., leader/director of research institute, network, collaborative). Research leading to the promotion to Professor is expected to have a demonstrable positive impact on their field of study.

Publications and other products

For tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor and for tenure, candidates are expected to have established a strong reputation in their field based on a body of published work. Publications should be in peer-reviewed journals. There must be evidence that the candidate has led the work and its dissemination. There must be sufficient publications from work carried out at the University of Georgia to provide evidence that a successful research program has been established and that it will be maintained into the future. The number of

publications will vary by field, but a regular pattern of publishing and disseminating research is expected. The contribution of the candidate to multi-authored work should be made explicit.

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, candidates are expected to demonstrate a sustained strong reputation in their field based on a body of published work carried out at the University of Georgia. Publications are expected to appear in peer-reviewed journals that have a reputation for quality.

Works other than publications can be taken into account in assessing the reputation of a candidate. Publications, preprints, products (e.g., software, programs, tools, resources) and output beyond works published in scholarly journals are valuable evidence of scholarly activity. The candidate is responsible for demonstrating the impact or potential impact of the products of their scholarship. The guiding principle for assessing the value of all outputs will be documentation that the work has been evaluated externally and the community of researchers or practitioners in the candidate's field finds value in the work. Thus, for example, books can be considered if there is evidence that these works have been adopted in courses in other universities, or have sufficient sales to indicate a strong presence. An issued U.S. patent can count as a publication provided there is evidence of some impact of this patent in the candidate's field of study or a commercial application. Information made available in publicly available databases or on the web can be counted as a publication, providing there is evidence of peer evaluation and/or usage by others. For multi-authored works, the contribution of the candidate must be made clear as well as the nature of the contribution of all other authors.

Funding

For all faculty with any of their effort allocated to scholarly research, external funding is expected proportionate to the cost of research in the candidate's field. The quantity of funding is therefore specific to the field of study; the principle of developing a sustainable program that permits a pattern of regular publication and dissemination of research, training of doctoral students (if a member of the graduate faculty) and training of postdoctoral scholars will be applied. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, a record of renewing or maintaining grant funding is expected, as well as a sustained record of training. Funding can include securing external grants for research training, research equipment, research networks, and other infrastructure that supports the larger research mission of the Department.

Collaborative Research

For any collaborative research or funding, the candidate's role must be documented and explained.

Other criteria

Other indicators of the quality of research can include internal or external recognition of the candidate's scholarly work. These might be, for example, awards or recognition by journals via editorial items, invited talks at symposia and research institutions, book chapters, organizing and/or chairing symposia sessions, service on grant agency panels and editorial boards, and service to professional societies.

Teaching & Mentoring

Teaching includes formal classroom/laboratory instruction and mentoring students. The primary criterion to be used for consideration for promotion is teaching and mentoring effectiveness. Teaching and mentoring effectiveness involve supporting the development of students' knowledge, skills, and abilities; and creating inclusive learning environments that support equitable educational experiences and outcomes for diverse students.

For most tenure-track appointments where a portion of the effort is assigned to teaching, teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level is expected. Teaching at the undergraduate level can include lecture courses, supervision of undergraduate research that is associated with independent research course numbers, and laboratory instruction. Teaching at graduate level may include lectures in courses listed at 6000 or above, and supervision of doctoral students and postdoctoral scientists.

Teaching

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer, candidates are expected to show evidence of teaching effectiveness from multiple perspectives, such as students, trained peers, and the instructor's written narrative.

Evidence of effectiveness from students should be systematically collected and analyzed to support claims about quality and/or improvement. Evidence of effectiveness from students can come from mandatory course evaluations, instructor-created surveys, research-based assessments of learning or other outcomes, or other sources of student data. In course evaluations, effectiveness may be represented by positive student evaluations or by a pattern of improvement in student evaluation feedback over time. Comparisons should not be made among faculty due to known biases in student evaluations. Candidates should report evaluation response rates for each semester and course, and are strongly encouraged to take steps to achieve response rates greater than 50%. Appropriate analysis of student written comments involves identifying and describing themes that are illustrated with example quotes. Cherry-picked student comments or student letters alone are not convincing evidence of teaching effectiveness.

Evidence of effectiveness from peers should involve observations of more than one class period, review of class materials, and discussion between the candidate and observers to review the context and goals of the overall course and specific class sessions to be observed.

The narrative should describe the candidate's efforts to improve their teaching and evidence of the effectiveness of these efforts. This might include how the candidate has developed new knowledge and skills for teaching, identified areas for growth or refinement, developed new courses or materials, incorporated evidence-based teaching strategies, or otherwise improved or refined their teaching. Candidates can reflect on evidence of the effectiveness of improvements seen in data from students and/or peer observations.

Mentoring

For faculty with research effort, mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and postdocs in research is a considerable component of teaching responsibilities. Candidates may act as formal and informal mentors. Effective mentoring can include skill development, career

guidance, acknowledgement of achievements, advocacy, role modeling, and psychological and emotional support.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, candidates are expected to demonstrate mentoring effectiveness using multiple forms of evidence. Evidence of effective mentoring includes: a pattern of graduate mentees meeting program milestones; mentees' first-author publications; mentees' presentations, awards, and other products and accomplishments; a pattern of creating a welcoming, inclusive, and supportive training environment for diverse mentees; consistent patterns of other mentoring best practices; and efforts to learn and improve as mentors.

Service

All faculty are expected to provide service to the Department, University, and discipline by service on committees and/or in leadership roles. Senior faculty are expected to carry a heavier load of academic governance than an Assistant Professor. Service includes, but is not limited to, committee work, editorships, peer review, conference organizing, recruitment, community outreach, etc. in the Department, university, discipline, and broader society.

Student Success Activities

Student success activities, as defined in University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10, is a comprehensive term for faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Student success is supported by in-class as well as outside-of-class efforts. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort but is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration. The Department of Genetics accepts all examples in this document as student success activities.

Approved by the Genetics faculty: December 14, 2023

Approved by the Department Head: December 21, 2023

Approved by the Dean: January 26, 2024

Approved by the Provost: April 17, 2024