

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

Department of Marine Sciences

Approved by the Faculty, May 3, 2016

Approved by the Dean, May 6, 2016

Approved by the Provost, May 10, 2016

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Marine Sciences 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. This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Marine Sciences, 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, the Dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

Responsibilities of the faculty in the Department of Marine Sciences fall within three broad areas: research and scholarship; teaching; and service to the Department, the University, the profession, and society. Contributions in all three areas are valued; for the purposes of promotion and tenure considerations, the relative weight of achievements in each area will reflect the EFT distribution of the candidate over the course of the evaluation period.

Advisement and Annual Evaluations: 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. He or she will sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

For each assistant professor, the head will appoint two senior faculty mentors, one stationed on campus and the other at Skidaway Institute of Oceanography (SkIO), who will advise on matters of teaching, research, the department, and promotion and tenure.

Annual evaluations will be provided to all faculty in accordance with the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. In the written annual evaluation, the department head (with input from the Executive Director of SkIO in the case of faculty stationed at SkIO) will provide written advice to faculty below the rank of professor on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure (if appropriate). Evaluations will reference the Department's Promotion and Tenure Criteria, and will clearly state whether the relevant criteria are being met.

Third-year review: At the start of the spring semester of the third full year in rank at UGA, each assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections IVa, IVb and V of the promotion dossier described in the *Guidelines*. Section IVa (the CV) will be in the format described in the Provost's Administrative Guidelines. The department head will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

By the end of January, the department head will appoint a committee of three eligible faculty members (as defined in the *Guidelines*) to review the candidate's dossier and performance. One of the candidate's faculty mentors will serve as a member of this committee. This committee will review the progress of the candidate, using such evidence as publications and works in progress, record of grantsmanship, observations of teaching performance, student evaluations, and other evidence of achievements in research and instruction as they deem appropriate. On the basis of this review, the committee will write a report that presents in detail its finding 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 each of the departmental expectations for promotion and tenure, as defined in this document. A copy of the report will be given to both the candidate and the department head. The candidate will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the review, and this response will be made available at the faculty meeting at which the votes on the report and renewal of the candidate are taken.

The committee will present their report (and candidate's response, if any), along with any new documentation (e.g. new awards, publications and/or grants received) to the tenured faculty at a faculty meeting scheduled for this purpose. This meeting will occur at the end of the spring semester of the candidate's third year. The faculty will discuss and vote on the following question:

“Has [Candidate's name] made sufficient progress towards tenure and promotion to associate professor?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” by secret ballot on this question. If the majority of faculty vote “No”, a second vote will be taken on the following question:

“Shall the candidate's contract be terminated?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” by secret ballot on this question. The contract of a candidate who receives a majority of “Yes” votes on the question will not be renewed.

The head will meet with the candidate and give him/her a written statement of the departmental vote(s) that includes a report of the relevant discussion within 1 week of the vote. Regardless of the outcome of the vote, the candidate will have the option of responding to the report in writing within 30 days of receiving it, and the candidate's response will become part of the record of the Third Year Review.

The candidate may request reconsideration of an unfavorable faculty vote. The reconsideration request must be submitted within 10 working days of the receipt by the candidate of the report

from the department head. The candidate may supply additional material in support of his/her case in the reconsideration request and may present his/her case to the eligible faculty in person. Reconsideration shall culminate in a second faculty vote to address the questions above. If the vote on the second question (“shall the candidate’s contract be terminated”) is affirmative, the candidate’s contract will not be renewed. The department head will prepare a brief written report of the reconsideration discussion, including the outcome of the vote. This report shall be given to the candidate within 3 working days of the meeting. This second report, as well as any additional materials submitted by the candidate to support her/his case shall also become part of the record of the Third Year Review.

Preliminary Consideration: The Department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the *Guidelines*. In the spring of the appropriate year, by the deadline of February 1, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will communicate this wish in writing to the department head.

The candidate will by April 1 present a vita, copies of at least 3 peer-reviewed publications, and statements of achievements in teaching, research and service to the department head. The head will convene a meeting of eligible faculty on or before the last day of the semester to consider whether the candidate’s request for promotion and/or tenure should move forward. In cases where the department head is not ‘eligible’ according to the *Guidelines*, he/she will nevertheless be present at this meeting, although he/she will not cast a vote. The faculty will vote on the following question:

“Should [Candidate’s name] be formally reviewed for promotion to the [next rank] [and/or] for tenure?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. The results will be conveyed by the 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.

Formal Review: In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the Department of Marine Sciences will follow the *Guidelines*.

All original materials underlying the information reported in sections 4 or 5 (e.g. publications, class evaluations, etc.) shall be provided to the head at least 4 weeks prior to the meeting when formal review of the application for promotion/tenure takes place, in order that he/she can verify the contents of the dossier as mandated by the *Guidelines*. The completed dossier (excluding sections 1 and 2) will be made available to eligible faculty members at least one week prior to the meeting at which the application is formally considered.

The head will convene a faculty meeting after the start of the fall semester, and no later than one week prior to the Franklin College deadline for promotion/tenure dossiers, to discuss the candidate's accomplishments and vote on a recommendation. The eligible faculty will vote on the following questions:

“Should [Candidate's name] be promoted to the rank of [next rank]?”

“Should [Candidate's name] be tenured?”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on these questions by secret ballot as per the *Guidelines*. At the time of voting the head will sign his/her ballot; his/her vote will be announced after the votes have been tallied. The results will be conveyed in writing by the head (or designee) to the candidate within three working days of the vote.

If the head is not part of the eligible faculty for a given application, he/she will not be present during the consideration of that application. In this case, an eligible faculty member designated by the head will chair the discussion and be responsible for preparing parts 1 & 2 of the Dossier, as detailed in the *Guidelines*. This designee will be required to reveal his/her vote on the application in question, as described above for the head.

Requests for reconsideration by candidates who do not receive a positive recommendation (simple majority of votes) will be handled in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

Criteria for Tenure and for Promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor

Candidates for Associate Professor must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional and national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level. Candidates for Professor 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. Unless the candidates' assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Marine Sciences faculty are expected to participate actively in academic research and scholarship, graduate and undergraduate instruction, and committee work and similar departmental and university assignments.

Evaluation of candidates under these guidelines will take into account the candidate's work assignment (i.e. EFT distribution) over the time period under consideration. If a faculty member's work assignment involves activities that are expected to result in different *kinds* of teaching, research or service productivity than are included here, the department head and the faculty member must agree in writing at the time of appointment (or change in assignment) as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement.

Research/Scholarship

With respect to scholarly research in Marine Sciences, 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. Promotion to Professor requires evidence of sustained growth, both of international reputation and training activities. Research leading to the promotion to Professor is expected to have a demonstrable positive impact on the candidate's field of study. Sustainability includes a regular pattern of dissemination of research to the international community appropriate for the 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 Marine Sciences, but evidence of the candidate's 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 his/her research.

Publications

For tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates are expected to have established a national reputation with a clear path toward an international reputation in their field based on a body of published work. Publications should be in refereed journals that are widely available. 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. For publications on which the candidate was not the lead or corresponding author, nor the primary advisor for a student or postdoctoral lead author, the candidate's intellectual contribution shall be described and corroborated.

For promotion from Associate to full Professor, candidates are expected to have established a recognizable international 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 an international reputation for quality. It is expected that the research of candidates for full Professor will be well cited in their field compared with others pursuing research in that field.

Works other than publications can be taken into account in assessing the international standing of a candidate. Publications, products (e.g., software, programs) and output beyond works published in scholarly journals are valuable evidence of scholarly activity as long as peer evaluation has occurred, and the relative contribution of the candidate is made clear. 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 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 international presence. An issued US 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.

Funding

External funding is expected to be proportionate to the cost of research in the candidate's field, as scaled by the Research EFT. The quantity of funding is therefore specific to the field of study. Funding levels are expected to be sufficient to develop and sustain a program that includes regular publication and dissemination of research, training of graduate students (if a member of the graduate faculty) and training of postdoctoral scholars. For promotion from Associate to full Professor, a record of renewing or maintaining sustained grant funding and training is required, as well as a sustained record of training. Collaborative research projects are valued. It is the candidate's role and intellectual contributions in multi-investigator awards that will determine the significance of those awards in the promotion and tenure evaluation. Therefore these must be clearly stated.

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 highly visible 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

For appointments where a portion of the EFT is assigned to teaching, the candidate must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching that is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum (which may include on-line and distance offerings). Effectiveness can be demonstrated through the following: (i) Student and peer evaluations indicative of effective undergraduate and/or graduate instruction. Evaluations are expected to demonstrate that the candidate provides a classroom environment that promotes student learning and inquiry. (ii) Mentoring undergraduate students in the research laboratory. Students are expected to engage in meaningful research activities which could be demonstrated by student presentations in lab meetings, written summaries of research findings prepared by students,

inclusion of students as co-authors or their acknowledgement in peer-reviewed papers, or presentations or posters given by the students at local, regional or national conferences. (iii) Service as major advisor for M.S. and Ph.D. students who are making satisfactory progress toward their degrees. (iv) Publications and abstracts on which the candidate's graduate students are authors, especially first authors.

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.

Service

All faculty are expected to provide service to the department and the university by service on committees. Senior faculty are expected to carry a heavier load of academic governance than an Assistant Professor.

Faculty who are not budgeted for formal service are expected to function in a professional and timely manner in their committee work and other responsibilities. It is also expected that they serve as reviewers of scientific manuscripts and grant proposals, participate in regular events of their community (e.g. through professional societies) as well as outreach activities.

Candidates who have a service component in their EFT will be expected to demonstrate exemplary service to Society, beyond the relatively limited activities described above. In this context service to Society refers to activities that apply academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of departmental, College, and University missions. It can include applied research, service-based instruction and training, and technical consultation and assistance.

Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation play a critical role in the promotion and tenure process by giving the reviewing faculty an independent assessment of the candidate's qualifications. Generally, external referees will be full Professors or their equivalent and recognized experts with international reputations in the candidate's field of study and scholarship. Promotion dossiers will document that each referee is qualified to provide a fair and honest appraisal of the candidate's accomplishments.