

**Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedures, and Procedures  
for Third-Year Review  
School of Chemical, Materials, and Biomedical Engineering (CMBE)  
College of Engineering, University of Georgia**

School of Chemical, Materials, and Biomedical Engineering (CMBE) Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure (October 2023)  
Supplement to the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

This document supplements the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, Spring 2014 (available at: [https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/Guidelines for Appointment Promotion Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty 8-1-2023.pdf](https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/Guidelines%20for%20Appointment%20Promotion%20Tenure%20of%20Academic%20Rank%20Faculty%208-1-2023.pdf)).

These guidelines specify that the School of CMBE has adopted its own written procedure and criteria for promotion and tenure to supplement the university guidelines with discipline-specific guidelines. In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the School of CMBE 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 Promotion and Tenure document and the University Guidelines. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document, or if this Promotion and Tenure document does not address a certain issue, the University's Guidelines will supersede this document.

This document is applicable only to tenure-track faculty in the School of CMBE. Tenure-track faculty includes those faculty members who are eligible to receive institutional tenure as defined by the University Guidelines. These faculty members hold the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the appointment unit and must be reviewed and approved by the Dean of the College of Engineering (CENGR) and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this Promotion and Tenure document and University Guidelines. In addition, the faculty, Dean, and Provost must approve any changes or updates to this Promotion and Tenure document. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the Promotion and Tenure document.

# I. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

## a. Promotion and Tenure Committees and Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU)

### PTU

**Composition and formation process** – The PTU shall consist of all appointed CMBE faculty eligible to vote in the candidate’s faculty track (at least one rank above the current position of the individual nominated for promotion and/or tenure).

**Duties** – The PTU will provide a formal vote of support of or opposition to the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure to the Dean. The Chair of CMBE (hence forth School Chair) is the PTU head and is to chair the PTU voting meetings (preliminary and final vote). The School Chair is to ensure consistency and enforce University and College procedures.

**Duties** – The School Chair in consultation with the CMBE faculty and candidate will select the three faculty to serve on the First Level Review Committee (FLRC) described below. The School Chair will call a meeting of the FLRC, charge the committee, and decide on a mutually agreed committee chair.

### First Level Review Committee (FLRC)

**Composition and formation process** – A FLRC shall be established for each promotion and/or tenure case in CMBE. The FLRC shall consist of three members who are knowledgeable in the subject area(s) of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities. The committee shall consist of faculty selected by the candidate in consultation with the School Chair. Two of the FLRC members shall be appointed faculty in the School of CMBE. One FLRC member can be a UGA faculty member in the tenure track from outside the school (this person will be a non-voting member of the PTU). If enough CMBE faculty are not available to completely form the FLRC, additional committee members can be selected from CENGR faculty with similar research and teaching background to the candidate.

All faculty members on the FLRC will be those eligible to vote for the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure – those who are in the candidate’s faculty track and at least one rank above the position of the candidate nominated for promotion and/or tenure. The FLRC will work with the School Chair to select one member from this committee to serve as the chair of the FLRC committee. The chair of the FLRC committee and School Chair must be an appointed faculty member from CMBE. If enough CMBE faculty are not available to select an FLRC chair, the chair can be selected from CENGR faculty with similar research and teaching background to the candidate. The School Chair is tasked with the responsibility of governing the review process and ensuring consistency among FLRCs of all candidates.

**Duties** – The FLRC will ensure that policies for tenure and promotion for CENGR and the

University of Georgia are followed. In addition, the FLRC will review the candidate's dossier and present a summary of the candidate's achievements to the PTU during the voting meeting. The FLRC does not make promotion and tenure decisions; its function is to advise candidates and inform the faculty.

**b. Nomination**

Faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure shall notify the School Chair in writing no later than February 1 of the academic year prior to the academic year in which they wish to be considered. Such requests will be honored by the School Chair, consistent with the UGA "Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure." Those candidates who are in their 6<sup>th</sup> year (last year) of Assistant Professorship, will be required by the School Chair to apply for promotion and tenure.

**c. Dossier Preparation and Review**

**Overview**

Each individual who wants to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must submit materials according to the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure document. The FLRC shall assure the original submission follows this form. Preparation and verification of the contents of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the candidate and the FLRC with the candidate having the final say about the dossier's contents, except for the required external letters of review to be included by the FLRC. For the purposes of the FLRC and the PTU evaluation, only Sections 3 (Unit Criteria), 4 (Vita and 2-page Statement of Major Accomplishments), 5 (Achievements), and 7 (External Evaluations) of the dossier need be included. The candidate is expected to provide Sections 4 and 5 to the FLRC.

**Preliminary Consideration**

An FLRC will be formed for each candidate wishing to be considered for promotion and/or tenure by February 15. On a non-business day, the deadline will be the following business day. The candidate's dossier, prepared according to above guidelines should be submitted to the FLRC by March 1 and will be considered for a preliminary promotion and/or tenure vote by the PTU. The FLRC does not make decisions or vote on the preliminary considerations but instead informs the PTU who shall conduct the preliminary vote. The candidate will be notified of the preliminary vote by April 30<sup>th</sup> and university guidelines will be followed to determine whether or not to proceed with the review process and request external letters. In almost all cases, it is the candidate's choice whether to proceed to the next level review, irrespective of the outcome of the preliminary consideration vote. Associate Professors who have unsuccessfully applied for promotion may not reapply for three years without a positive preliminary consideration vote.

**External Review Letters**

A minimum of four external appraisals of the quality of the candidate's work from highly qualified individuals are required as part of the dossier and needed for FLRC and PTU evaluations. The candidate will construct a list of up to four potential external evaluators and their qualifications as reviewers and submit them to the FLRC. The candidate can also construct

a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. The dossier must include at least two letters of evaluation from the candidate's list. In addition, the FLRC, working with the School Chair, shall receive at least two additional external review letters from individuals not included on the candidate's list. Based on the FLRC's request, the School Chair will contact external reviewers for their willingness to review the candidate's dossier and request letters of appraisal from these individuals no later than a week after the preliminary vote. Letters shall not be solicited from reviewers who have a clear conflict of interest. External review letters are suggested to be received by July 15. Per UGA Guidelines, all external letters of evaluation received must be included in the dossier.

### **PTU Evaluation and Recommendation**

A meeting will be requested for the PTU to discuss the candidate's dossier and external review letters and take a vote on recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. At this meeting the FLRC chair summarizes the findings of the committee to the PTU (CMBE) and School Chair. The vote shall be by secret ballot, except for the School Chair (PTU Head). The vote is recorded in writing and provided with the candidate's dossier and external letters to the School Chair.

The School Chair's vote must be revealed at the time the votes are counted, and the School Chair shall inform the candidate of their vote within three working days. The candidate has the option of requesting another voting eligible faculty member from the PTU to substitute for the School Chair, if the School Chair's vote is negative (i.e., write the recommendation cover letter sent to the Dean/College level committee).

After the PTU evaluation and vote, the School Chair shall provide the candidate the PTU vote results and recommendation along with summarizing the candidate's achievements and synthesizing faculty judgment, no later than September 1<sup>st</sup>. The identity of the external letter reviewers is redacted before candidate review of the letter. The candidate will have five working days to read and respond in writing about this material to the School Chair before it goes forward. The candidate may also request a meeting with the School Chair before the five-day deadline.

### **School Chair Recommendation**

After review of all materials, the School Chair shall notify the candidate of their recommendation and the basis for it. The PTU Head letter will be forwarded to the College-level P&T review committee. The candidate may submit a response to the PTU Head letter within five days for submission to the College Review Committee.

### **College Level Review**

Each nomination shall be forwarded by the School Chair (or the substitute faculty member) to the College Review Committee and shall be accompanied by the PTU Head's letter and recommendation along with the candidate's responses to the PTU Head's letter (if any).

## Important Dates

Note: all dates are of academic year prior to which the candidate is to be considered for promotion.

1. Nomination Due – February 1
2. FLRC Formed – February 15
3. Dossier Due to FLRC – March 1
4. Preliminary consideration by PTU conducted – April 15
5. External Reviewers Contacted – April 21
6. External Review Letters Received – July 15<sup>th</sup>
7. PTU Evaluation Completed – September 1<sup>st</sup>
8. Candidates Response If Requested – September 5<sup>th</sup>
9. PTU Head Letter to the College Review Committee – September 15<sup>th</sup>

## II. Procedures for Third-Year Review

### a. Review Committee (RC)

**Composition and formation process** – The RC will consist of three eligible faculty members. The School Chair can select one RC member to be a UGA faculty member from another engineering school (this member cannot be an adjunct faculty member). The eligible voting faculty will be those who are tenured or on tenure-track and hold the rank of associate professor or professor in CMBE. The formation of the RC will be the responsibility of the School Chair who acts as PTU Head, with the candidate providing recommendations for other members of the RC. The School Chair may choose to be a member of the RC. Once formed, the RC will select a chair to oversee the review.

The School Chair is to coordinate and oversee the 3<sup>rd</sup>-year review process to ensure consistency among the candidates and enforce University and College guidelines.

**Duties** – The RC's overall charge is to review the progress towards tenure and/or promotion; report its findings to the PTU (the School of CMBE), candidate, and School Chair; and prepare a final report. Specifically, the RC:

- Conducts a substantive review on progress towards tenure and/or promotion by: a) reviewing the dossier; b) receiving input in a one-hour faculty seminar presented by the candidate on his/her academic work and future plans
- Prepares an initial report and discusses it with the School Chair
- Provides the candidate with observations in a face-to-face meeting on progress towards tenure and/or promotion
- Requests the School Chair or designee to call a Third-Year Review Faculty Meeting of all eligible tenured faculty (i.e., associate and professor ranks) to present the initial findings, hear faculty deliberation, and vote on all candidates

- Provides final written report/recommendations and vote to the School Chair within 10 days of the Third-Year Review Faculty Meeting

## **PTU**

**Composition and formation process** – The PTU shall consist of all appointed CMBE tenured faculty eligible to vote in the candidate’s faculty track (at least one rank above the position of the individual being reviewed for third-year). The PTU for each review will be chaired by the School Chair.

**Duties** – The PTU will conduct a vote by secret ballot of the eligible faculty at the conclusion of the preliminary vote meeting. The RC findings are discussed at this meeting. The eligible faculty will vote to recommend to the School Chair “whether the candidate’s progress towards promotion is sufficient.” Similarly, the eligible faculty will also vote to recommend “whether the candidate’s progress towards tenure is sufficient.”

## **Procedures**

The third-year review occurs in the spring semester of the third year of appointment for Assistant Professors.

## **Preparation of Dossier**

The candidate, with guidance from the RC (mentioned in Section 3a above), will prepare a dossier that includes two sections – 4 (Vita and 2-page Statement of Major Accomplishments), and 5 (Achievements). These sections should follow the University Guidelines.

## **Candidate Seminar**

The candidate will present, in a one-hour seminar, to the faculty on their teaching, research, and service activities during the review period at UGA. This seminar will be open to all faculty. The scheduling of the seminar will occur through the coordination of the candidate and the RC chair.

## **Final Reporting**

The School Chair will prepare a written report regarding their evaluation of the candidate’s progress and the faculty vote. The candidate may meet in person with the School Chair to receive clarifications on the findings.

The candidate may reply in writing to the School Chair within 10 working days after receipt of the written report, and any reply will become part of the candidate’s third-year review. Within 5 working days from the faculty member’s reply, the PTU head 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. The findings and the response of the candidate will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.

## **Performance Enhancement Plan**

If the performance in any of the faculty member's assigned areas of effort is judged to be insufficient progress toward promotion and/or tenure, the School Chair, third-year review committee, and faculty member must develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member and remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period. The PRP generated by third-year review should be harmonized with a PRP generated by annual review, as needed, and must be approved by the Dean. The faculty member will have one year from the most recent update of the PRP to demonstrate a trajectory of appropriate progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

### **Renewal of Non-Tenured Faculty**

In any year, the School Chair may determine not to extend a contract to a non-tenured faculty member. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the School Chair by the RC consistent with CMBE Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (Section VII).

### **Important Dates**

1. Within one week after the start of the spring semester of the candidate's third year, in accordance with the UGA tenure clock calendar ([https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/UGA\\_Tenure\\_Clock\\_Calendar\\_23-24.pdf](https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/UGA_Tenure_Clock_Calendar_23-24.pdf)), the candidate informs the School Chair in writing to form the RC. The School Chair in turn forms the Review Committee following procedures outlined in Section 3a above.
2. The candidate submits sections 4 and 5 of the dossier (4-Vita and 2-page Summary of Major Accomplishments, and 5-Achievements) to the RC Chair within 30 business days after the start of the spring semester.
3. The candidate presents their teaching, research, and service accomplishments in a one-hour seminar to faculty within 30 days after submission of their dossier.
4. The RC completes the review of the candidate's dossier within 40 days after dossier submission.
5. The School Chair calls a Third-Year Review Faculty Meeting to take place within 80 days after the start of the spring semester.
6. The School Chair verbally provides feedback from the Third-Year Review Faculty Meeting to the candidate, followed by the final written report/recommendation to the Dean within 10 days from the Third-Year Review Faculty Meeting.
7. The candidate's reply (if any) to the RC Chair's written report must be received by the Dean within 10 days from the date of the report.

### III. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The University Guidelines outline the standards required for faculty to achieve promotion and tenure. All faculty must contribute to the teaching, research, or service missions of the university. Promotion and tenure are based on the candidate's performance in each of these areas. This document provides additional details for promotion and tenure within the School of CMBE. Note that dossiers are judged on a case-by-case basis, and the criteria in this document are understood as guidelines.

#### a. Contributions to Teaching

##### **The Standard**

CMBE recognizes that high-quality teaching at the undergraduate and graduate level is critical to the mission of the School. Candidates for promotion and tenure must exhibit excellence in teaching. The relative weight placed on teaching effectiveness when evaluating a candidate's overall level of performance should be commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentage of time in teaching. Key considerations in teaching effectiveness may include the following:

- *Classroom effectiveness*: The candidate must exhibit the ability to communicate effectively with the students. Evidence of effectiveness should be based on more than summarized teaching evaluations. Other evidence may include evaluations by colleagues that have observed the candidate's teaching or peer review of the candidate's teaching materials.
- *Scholarship of teaching and learning*: Conference proceedings, journal articles, or grants that have focused on scholarship of teaching and learning.
- *Course and curriculum development beyond the classroom*: The candidate must exhibit that they have contributed to the educational program beyond teaching their individual classes. Examples of this contribution include significantly revising existing courses, developing new courses, contributing to the development of a curriculum, and contributing to ABET review materials.
- *Contribution of the candidate to the interdisciplinary vision of CENGR*.

##### **Promotion to Associate and Full Professor**

For promotion to rank of professor, additional evidence of sustained excellence in teaching is necessary per UGA P&T guidelines.

##### **Tenure**

All of the above with additional documentation addressing the University's "continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do" and likelihood that the candidate will continue to be an active and productive scholar over the long period of time that tenure supposes (in accordance with UGA Guidelines).



### **Evidence of Excellence in Teaching**

In addition to the documentary evidence suggested in the University Guidelines, the candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of teaching excellence through some of the following:

- Statement on teaching achievements, detailing the candidate's personal teaching philosophy, major accomplishments in teaching effectiveness, and other contributions to the teaching program
- Teaching assignments, including descriptions of courses taught, student enrollments, and grade distributions for each class
- Graduate students supervised and placement and success of graduated students
- Professional development mentoring of graduate students in teaching
- Description of teaching materials developed such as textbooks, articles related to scholarship of teaching and learning, or similar conference proceedings
- Grants received or applied for that are focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning
- Summaries of classroom evaluations from students and other sources of evaluation such as peer-review and unsolicited letters from students
- Research mentorship for graduate and undergraduate students. Evidence of this mentoring could include publications jointly written with students, regular research meetings held with students, and joint presentations with students.

### **b. Contributions to Research**

#### **The Standard**

CMBE recognizes that high-quality research is critical to the mission of the School. Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in the faculty member's area of research. Research activities must be of high quality, and the review committee and external evaluators will distinguish between routine and outstanding. High-quality research is valued over quantity by CMBE. Research contributions that have been favorably reviewed by professional or academic peers will be weighted more heavily than those that have not. The relative weight placed on measurable research outputs (e.g., refereed journal articles) when evaluating a candidate's overall level of performance should be commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentage of time in research. Key considerations in research effectiveness include:

- *Impact*: Description of research areas and directions for future research, emphasizing impact of the research and how the candidate's research has contributed to research in their field or discipline
- *Scholarly output*: Publications and presentations in each of these areas
- *Research support*: Intramural and extramural research support the in form of grants or contracts
- *Interdisciplinarity*: Contribution of the candidate to the interdisciplinary mission of CMBE and CENGR in the form of interdisciplinary research programs (evidenced, for example, by co-authored publications or grants) where the candidate's scholarly work complements that of collaborating researchers

### **Promotion to Associate Professor**

Candidates must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities in their field of expertise. CMBE considers refereed publications to be the most important and widely accepted indicator of this emerging status as a regional or national authority. Publications will be evaluated on content, contribution, and the quality and appropriateness of the journals (or other outlets) relative to the candidate's appointment or field of study. The quality and appropriateness of journals should be documented by the candidate and the external evaluators. Although publication emphasis should always be on quality and contributions to a focused scholarly program, candidates with higher research appointments are expected to demonstrate higher levels of refereed journal article output commensurate with the assigned time in research. Selected and invited presentations at regional and national professional meetings and conferences, as well as both competitive and non-competitive extramural funding, are also important indicators of emerging status as a regional and national authority or scholar.

### **Promotion to Professor**

Candidates must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their fields of research and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature. For promotion to Professor, books and book chapters (especially invited chapters) may also be important indicators of national and international scholarly status. Selected and especially invited presentations at national and international professional meetings and conferences, as well as both competitive and non-competitive extramural funding, are also important indicators of national and international scholarly status. By this stage of a career, documentation of impact is highly desirable. Possible ways to document impact include citation indices, evidence of others adopting research results, or other means of estimating or relating impact.

### **Tenure**

All of the above with additional documentation addressing the University's continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do and likelihood that the candidate will continue to be an active and productive scholar over the long period of time that tenure supposes.

### **Evidence of Excellence in Research**

In addition to the possible sources of documentary evidence suggested in the University Guidelines, the candidate is expected to demonstrate research excellence and impact through some of the following:

- Special recognition of the candidate's scholarly works, such as awards, scholarly reviews, citations, and invited presentations
- Funded projects, grants, or contracts at the university level, and at state and federal levels
- Evidence of interdisciplinary collaborations, such as cross-disciplinary co-authorships
- Patents awarded, software deployed, technology transferred or adapted in the field

- Research contributions demonstrate sustained and programmatic activity as contrasted with unrelated and unfocused activity
- Editorial and referee services for academic journals

### **c. Contributions to Service and Outreach**

#### **The Standard**

CMBE recognizes that faculty members are responsible to a diverse set of stakeholders, including instructional programs, CENGR peers and leadership, University community, professional organizations, industry, and society at large. Candidates for promotion should demonstrate contributions to the service and outreach mission of CMBE with a high level of professionalism. The relative weight placed on service and outreach efforts when evaluating a candidate's overall level of performance should be commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentage of time in service and outreach. Key considerations in service effectiveness include:

- Contributions to instructional programs that include a service or outreach component within the course. These include areas such as curriculum development or ABET accreditation, providing guest lectures in topics related to service or outreach, and enhancement of existing courses to include a service or outreach component
- Contributions to CMBE and CENGR through engagement in faculty meetings and committees, when elected
- Contributions to professional organizations
- Contributions to community service-related organizations
- Contributions through serving as faculty mentors for student organizations
- Contributions to CMBE and CENGR outreach efforts to communities, governmental or other organizations, or industry

#### **Promotion to Associate Professor**

Candidates must demonstrate clear and convincing evidence of engagement with service to the instructional program, CMBE and CENGR, university, and professional organizations or societies.

#### **Promotion to Professor**

Candidates must demonstrate engagement with service responsibilities and leadership in some service areas to the instructional program, CMBE and CENGR, university, professional organizations, or societies.

#### **Tenure**

All of the above with additional documentation addressing the University's continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do and likelihood that the candidate will continue to be an active and productive scholar over the long period of time that tenure supposes.

## **Evidence of Excellence in Service and Outreach**

In addition to the possible sources of documentary evidence suggested in the University Guidelines, the candidate is expected to demonstrate service excellence through some of the following:

- Leadership in instructional groups, academic programs, projects, student organizations, or study-abroad initiatives
- Leadership functions in professional societies
- Leadership functions in professional conferences
- Leadership functions in community service-related organizations
- Activities as reviewer for peer-reviewed articles
- Activities as reviewer in grant review panels

Document revisions and approval by CMBE faculty:

October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023 – Draft reviewed by CMBE executive committee at an in-person meeting

October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – Draft Sent to CMBE faculty

October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (Revisions based on CMBE faculty feedback-JRK or Jim Kastner)

October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2023 (Revisions made again based on more CMBE faculty feedback-JRK)

October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023 (Meeting with School Chair and Dean, Revision made based on discussion)

November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (Revisions sent to CMBE Faculty for feedback)

November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (OFA feedback received)

December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023 (Meeting with Dean, Review OFA's comments)

December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023 (Revisions made based OFA's comments and Deans input)

December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (Revisions sent CMBE faculty)

December 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (Revisions made based on CMBE faculty feedback)

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (CMBE Faculty Meeting, Minor Changes, Faculty Vote)

December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 (CMBE vote - 21 "yes" votes and 0 "No" votes)

January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024 (Revisions based on feedback from Provost and Executive Committee Review)

Approved by CENGR Dean on January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Approved by the Provost on January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023