Faculty members must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Geosciences strives for excellence in creating and disseminating new knowledge, teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels, and service to the profession, the university, and the community. The purpose of this document is to present the criteria and policies for promotion and tenure in the Department. The Department has formulated these Promotion and Tenure Guidelines in conformity with the general requirements set forth by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Georgia State University, and the College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty members should consult the Georgia State University Promotion and Tenure Manual for Tenured and Tenure-Track Professors and the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of any conflict between College and Department policies, the policies of the College of Arts and Sciences take precedence.

The Department believes that tenured and tenure-track faculty members should be engaged in research that has an impact at national and international levels. The primary criteria for promotion and the award of tenure include a record of professional development having national or international impact in the candidate’s discipline; a record of excellence in teaching; and a sound record of service appropriate to the proposed rank or tenure status. The principal burden of proof lies with the candidate to present effectively the required information and evidence in his/her dossier.

II. REVIEW PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

The timing of the review and the instructions for submission of the dossier will follow the policies of Georgia State University and the College of Arts and Sciences. The review will assess the candidate’s Professional Development (research and scholarship), Teaching, and Service.

The relevant Department Promotion and Tenure Committee will write a report to the Department Chair assessing the candidate based on the specific criteria outlined below. The reasoning for each assessment will be succinctly explained with reference to the candidate’s dossier and supporting materials provided by the College. The report will also contain a recommendation as to whether the candidate has met the standards for promotion and/or tenure.

If a candidate believes that his or her expertise is better considered in an academic area of the College other than Natural and Computational Sciences, then the candidate may request in writing to be reviewed by one of the other Area Advisory Committees in the College, as stipulated in the College Manual.

The candidate’s dossier must reflect all work done since his or her initial appointment at Georgia State University, or since the completion of the dossier leading to promotion to his or her current rank at Georgia State University. The
candidate must consult the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Manual for dossier instructions, as well as for information regarding submission of work completed before appointment at Georgia State University. Materials for review by the Department Committee and Chair are restricted to the candidate’s dossier and external referee letters provided by the College of Arts and Sciences.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters related to the review process are strictly confidential. No party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about the review to anyone not directly involved, subject to applicable law.

III. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

a. Overall Assessment

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure and untenured Associate Professors who are candidates for tenure at their present rank must be evaluated as Excellent in both Professional Development and Teaching and as at least Good in Service.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor and untenured Professors who are candidates for Tenure must be evaluated as Excellent in both Professional Development and Teaching, and as at least Very Good in Service.

b. Evidence of Professional Development

For a rating of Excellent in Professional Development, the candidate should present evidence of a nationally recognized research program.

The Department acknowledges that a candidate’s scholarship is affected by many factors including access to appropriate experimental or analytical facilities, appropriate field localities or collections, and to databases and images. All factors will be taken into account in evaluating the candidate’s accomplishments. However, it is the responsibility of the candidate to assess the availability of appropriate facilities, personnel, and other resources so that the candidate’s research plan is ambitious but feasible. It is expected that by the time a faculty member is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, that faculty member has had extensive experience in developing and revising, as necessary, annual research plans in consultation with a senior faculty mentor and the Chair.

The candidate must submit evidence of professional development organized according to the categories of professional development listed in the College Manual (section V.E.). The following evidence may be considered in assessing Professional Development.

1) Publications
The candidate’s record of publication should be predominantly in rigorous peer-reviewed journals or, in the case of a book-publishing discipline, in nationally or internationally significant presses. The dossier should provide evidence of the disciplinary importance of the publishing venues, and the impacts of the candidate’s publications. Examples of impacts and disciplinary importance may include but are not limited to publication citation records, journal impact factors, external referee assessments, and published indices of scholarly productivity.

A mix of first-authored and co-authored publications may be appropriate depending on the candidate’s specialty. For those in fields where collaborative work is common, the value of such research, particularly funded by the candidate’s external funds, and publication with students under the candidate’s supervision, may be recognized. Because different subdisciplines have different customs in authorship, the candidate should provide a statement contextualizing their authorship in their subdiscipline. In all cases, a candidate’s independent research program should be represented by one or both of the following types of publishing records: a strong record of first authorship on publications or co-authored publications, especially when the candidate’s role in acquiring external funds or supervising student authors is clear. The contribution of the candidate to each publication should be explained in detail, particularly when the candidate is not the first author.

Pedagogical publications (i.e. the scholarship of learning) are typically considered as contributions to Teaching. However, this type of publication is normally considered in the area of Professional Development for candidates hired as Geoscience Education faculty. If a candidate elects to present pedagogical publications as evidence of Professional Development impact, then the candidate should clearly demonstrate the work’s impact on the development of a nationally or internationally significant research program.

2) Extramural Funding

Extramural funding is typically in the form of grants, fellowships, contracts, and sub-contracts. Extramural funding is a significant indication of research productivity because 1) it allows the candidate to pay for research needs and to support undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students; and 2) success in obtaining peer-reviewed or competitive grants is a strong indication of the significance of the proposed research. Faculty members are expected to seek and/or acquire the extramural funding required to carry out their research programs, which may include support of field, laboratory, database, or archive activities, and students. Research grants, contracts, fellowships, and seed grants should normally be nationally competitive and peer-reviewed.

The Department recognizes that different disciplines have different levels of federal and other funding available. The candidate should seek funding levels
appropriate to his or her discipline. In most fields of geology and geography, typical project budgets are in the range of $35-70K per year, over two to three years. Individual project budgets from grants, contracts, and subcontracts may vary widely, and the norm for certain subdisciplines may be higher or lower.

The candidate’s leadership in research design is signified by PI, Co-PI, or Co-I status on attempted or successful grants. Funding as Co-PI or Co-I is of value, but the candidate’s record should indicate attempts, even if unsuccessful, to obtain funding as PI, as an indication of an independent research program. In cases where the candidate is Co-PI or Co-I, a central role and strong intellectual contribution should be clearly explained.

Indication of effort to secure funding may include copies of proposals and reviewers’ comments on proposals. If a candidate elects to submit reviewers’ comments for any proposal, then the full set of comments and scores received from the agency must be provided.

3) Conference Presentations

Presentation at national or international conferences is recognized as an indicator of a candidate’s participation in the larger academic community. While presentations do not hold the same weight as peer-reviewed publications, they are valuable tools that may lead to publication, develop peer networks, and lead to greater impact on the discipline.

4) Invitations

Some invitations may signify national or international impact of a candidate’s research program. These invitations include funded invitations by government agencies; societies; universities; or institutions to present or to design research; or funded invitations to participate in significant national or international professional conferences, workshops, and roundtables.

5) Significant Professional Service

Although they may not constitute the conduct of research, some aspects of service to the Profession may signify national or international impact of a candidate’s research program. These activities include: service as reviewer or panelist for national level funding agencies; service as peer-reviewer of manuscripts to journals in the candidate’s area of interest; convening national or international conferences or symposia; serving on editorial boards of peer reviewed journals or as an associate editor, discipline editors, or editor-in-chief.

6) Other
Other evidence of national or international impact of the candidate’s research program may be presented. The burden of proof is on the candidate to demonstrate the national or international significance of any other research accomplishment.

**c. Professional Development Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure**

For an assessment of *Excellent*, the candidate has produced a record of scholarship establishing a national reputation in his or her discipline.

For each year of service as an Assistant Professor, the candidate has published typically on average more than one refereed article or book chapter, or the candidate has published a book during the tenure-earning period.

The candidate has been a PI on an externally funded project including "seed" grant funding, or has been Co-PI (or Co-I) on an externally funded project and/or has made sustained attempts at funding as PI with positive reviews.

The candidate has made presentations at national conferences, and has played active roles in professional service.

**d. Professional Development Guidelines for Promotion to Professor or Award of Tenure at the Rank of Professor**

For an assessment of *Excellent*, the candidate has produced a record of scholarship with a clearly established national reputation in his or her discipline.

For each year of service as an Associate Professor, or for each year since the last post-tenure review, the candidate has published at least an average of one refereed article or book chapter, or the candidate has published a book in a well-regarded press.

The candidate has a record of maintaining a top-quality research program and, where appropriate to disciplinary norms, has sustained external funding as PI.

The candidate has made presentations at national conferences, and has played leadership roles in service to the profession.

**e. Evidence of Teaching**

The record of Teaching built by the candidate should show a commitment to communicating the Geosciences to students and developing in them an excitement about, and understanding of, the many and varied components and aspects of the Earth system and its inhabitants. In this area, the candidate will
present evidence that includes his or her teaching portfolios from the years under review in addition to other supporting documentation. The materials should document not only classroom teaching, but also work with individual undergraduate and graduate students. In addition, participation in pedagogical development or conferences is recognized as an important activity. Where appropriate, candidates may include the development and/or presentation of local, regional, or national instructional workshops as evidence of Teaching.

The candidate must submit documentation of teaching activities organized according to the categories of teaching listed in the College Manual (section V.F.). The following evidence may be considered in assessing Teaching.

1) Course Development

Documents showing development of new courses, and updating of older courses, may be presented in course portfolios. Courses should show up-to-date expertise in the field, effective use of instructional technologies, as appropriate, and high standards. Such material may include syllabi, course handouts, student exemplar products, and other materials.

2) Guidance of Student Research

Documents showing effective guidance of student research, which may include thesis and dissertation signature pages, directed studies, honors theses, grants and awards obtained by students, and other related materials.

3) Evidence of Positive Student Feedback

One set of markers of effectiveness in classroom, laboratory, and field instruction includes the pattern of scores and tone of comments across student course evaluations, which are evaluated taking into account such factors as the type of course. Numerical measures of student feedback and written comments should indicate the candidate’s abilities to enhance student interest and to stimulate work and achievement by students. Written comments should show evidence of a supportive teacher with high standards.

4) External Grants for Teaching, Pedagogy, and Research Training

In addition to grants specifically supporting instructional, pedagogical, or training programs, fellowships and stipends for undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs on external research grants may be included. Competitive internal grants supporting Teaching may also be applicable.

5) Publications in Education or Pedagogical Journals
Publications contributing to the scholarship of teaching and learning are valued. Such publications may be considered in Professional Development (with justification) or Teaching, but not in both. As with publications considered under Professional Development, publications considered under Teaching should be in rigorous peer-reviewed literature.

6) Appropriate Levels of Student Performance

Rates of students withdrawing or being awarded grades of D or F (DFW rates) should not be significantly outside Department norms. Rates of students being awarded grades of A-, A or A+ should not be significantly outside Department norms. For both DFW and A-/A/A+ rates, the Undergraduate Director will provide the candidate with Department grade distribution data for introductory and upper level courses. It is up to the candidate to contextualize their grade distribution data and provide supporting explanations of grade distributions significantly outside Department norms.

7) Evidence of Student Success

As the goal of mentoring, advising, and research training is to provide students with tools for success, it is useful to provide evidence of that success. Such evidence may include documentation of former students entering graduate programs, obtaining awards and honors, or taking professional positions. Presentations or publications by students stemming from research may also be applicable.

8) Evidence of Teaching Creativity

Examples of evidence for teaching creativity may include but not limited to: the development of innovative pedagogical methods (relative to past delivery of courses or relative to current ways of teaching for a given course) for undergraduate or graduate teaching; the successful implementation of innovative teaching methods; and publications/workshops/presentations teaching pedagogical methodologies.

f. Guidelines for Assessment of Teaching

For an assessment of Excellent, the candidate has produced a strong record of teaching. The candidate provides evidence documenting achievement in 5 of the 8 areas of evidence of Teaching including 1, 2, and 3.
g. Evidence of Service

All faculty members are expected to be “good citizens” in the department, helping to promote and to support the academic and other programs that the department provides. The faculty member should strive for a sound service record. Service on appropriate Department, College, University, and/or USG committees should be accepted in consultation with the Chair.

The candidate must submit documentation of service activities organized according to the categories of service listed in the College Manual (section V.G.). Service activities considered include the following:

- Supervision of the purchase, repair, and maintenance of Department instrumentation.
- Providing technical training to faculty, staff, or students, in field, laboratory, or other analytical methods.
- Recruitment of undergraduate or graduate students to the Department.
- Membership on Department committees.
- Membership on College or University Committees.
- Membership on committees of professional organizations.
- Leadership in professional organizations.
- Membership in professional advisory boards serving the public.
- Engaging in K-12 support activities that are not suitable for inclusion as a Teaching activity.
- Engaging in professionally-related public outreach.

h. Guidelines for Assessment of Service

Effective service is important to the function of the Department and the institution. However, the Department acknowledges that extensive service, especially for untenured faculty, can decrease the potential for scholarship and teaching. It is thus expected that a candidate will perform service requests competently and in a timely fashion, but that the Department will minimize requests for service from untenured faculty. In general, Assistant Professors are expected to perform service at the Departmental level, rather than at the College or University level.

Assistant Professors may be judged to have performed Good service, thus suitable for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor if they submit evidence of effective service at the Department level.

Associate Professors seeking promotion to Professor and untenured Professors seeking tenure at their present rank must be evaluated as Very Good in Service to be recommended for promotion. An evaluation of Very Good at this level entails a strong record of service, including effective participation not only at the Department level, but also at the College and/or University level and in the academic discipline.
IV. DEPARTMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEES ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure and untenured Associate Professors who are candidates for Tenure will be reviewed by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee I (P&T-I). P&T-I is composed of all tenured faculty members in the Department, excluding the Department Chair.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor and untenured Professors who are candidates for Tenure will be reviewed by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee II (P&T-II). P&T-II is composed of all tenured faculty members holding the rank of Professor, excluding the Department Chair.

The Department Chair will appoint one of the members of each Committee as the Chair of the Committee. The Dean will appoint Committee members from other Departments to comprise a Committee of at least 3 faculty members of the appropriate rank if necessary. No faculty member with a conflict of interest may participate in the review process at any level.

All Committees will report by majority vote and issue a recommendation to the Department Chair. If necessary, a dissenting minority report must be submitted to the Chair along with the Committee report. Signatures for the report and any minority report should be on a separate sheet of paper.
APPENDIX I:
Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development. No publications, presentations, or grants are presented.

Fair: The faculty member has a limited research program evidenced by only occasional publications or meeting presentations with no indication of growth in research profile.

Good: The faculty member has a limited but growing research program, evidenced by some peer-reviewed publications or attempts for grants.

Very Good: The faculty member has a research program with the potential to develop into an emerging nationally competitive research program, evidenced by publications, acquisition of modest grants and attempts for major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.

Excellent: The faculty member has established a nationally recognized research program, or there are clear indications that the faculty member is well on the way to establishing a nationally recognized research program, as evidenced by publications, acquisition of major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved an internationally recognized research program, as evidenced by national or international awards, publications, acquisition of major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member’s teaching record shows a need for significant improvement, and suggests that the faculty member is a substandard, ineffective teacher. Only one of the Departmental criteria listed in the Promotion and Tenure document is met.

Fair: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to meet all obligations sufficiently. Only one or two of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met.

Good: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to meet all obligations sufficiently. Two or three of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met.

Very Good: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an effective teacher, making efforts at improving his or her teaching effectiveness. Three or four of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3).

Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an innovative, exceptional teacher who has marked impact on student learning and success, providing major leadership in development of instruction in the department and/or university community. Five of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3).

Outstanding: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an innovative, exceptional teacher who has marked impact on student learning and success, recognized as a national leader in development of instruction and/or training of students or post-docs. Seven or eight of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3).
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

Fair: The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

Good: The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and college levels, as well as participating in professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.
APPENDIX II:
Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Professional Development

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of professional development. No publications, presentations, or grants are presented.

Fair: The faculty member has a limited research program evidenced by only occasional publications or meeting presentations with no indication of growth in research profile.

Good: The faculty member has a limited but growing research program, evidenced by some peer-reviewed publications or attempts for grants.

Very Good: The faculty member has an emerging nationally competitive research program, evidenced by publications, acquisition of modest grants and attempts for major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.

Excellent: The faculty member continues to maintain and advance a nationally recognized research program, as evidenced by publications, a sustained level of major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.

Outstanding: The faculty member has achieved an internationally recognized research program, as evidenced by national or international awards, publications, a sustained level of major funding (as appropriate to the faculty member’s subdiscipline), and presentations.
B. Teaching

Poor: The faculty member’s teaching record shows a need for significant improvement, and suggests that the faculty member is a substandard, ineffective teacher. Only one of the Departmental criteria listed in the Promotion and Tenure document is met.

Fair: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to meet all obligations sufficiently. Only one or two of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met.

Good: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to meet all obligations sufficiently. Two or three of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met.

Very Good: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an effective teacher, making efforts at improving his or her teaching effectiveness. Three or four of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3).

Excellent: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an innovative, exceptional teacher who has marked impact on student learning and success, providing major leadership in development of instruction in the department and/or university community. Five of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3). Normally, the record should demonstrate significant and highly effective involvement in the direction of individual student work (item 2) beyond that which is expected at the junior faculty level.

Outstanding: The faculty member’s teaching record shows him or her to be an innovative, exceptional teacher who has marked impact on student learning and success, recognized as a national leader in development of instruction and/or training of students or post-docs. Seven or eight of the Departmental criteria listed for Teaching in the Promotion and Tenure document are met (including 1, 2, and 3).
C. Service

**Poor:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests no other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but without a documentable, significant impact.

**Fair:** The faculty member may show up at general faculty meetings but manifests few other significant service accomplishments. The faculty member may serve on other departmental committees, but with few effective contributions to the business of those committees.

**Good:** The faculty member responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities and is of significant assistance to colleagues.

**Very Good:** The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service and leadership at the department and college levels, as well as participating in professional associations.

**Excellent:** The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective leadership that has involved significant departmental or other college or university administrative functions. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described as above as very good.

**Outstanding:** In addition to the level of service described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department and throughout the college and university, as well as in national and international professional organizations.