TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES
(Adopted by the Faculty 02/18/98)

In this Section of the Governance Document, we give Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure in the Physics Department. In developing these Guidelines and Criteria, we have considered the goals we desire to obtain for the Department, taking into account existing College and University Guidelines.

Our goals are to have a Department which: (1) has a reputation for excellent and stimulating teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels; (2) has high visibility in the national and international physics research community; (3) offers an environment conducive to professional growth; and (4) helps to serve Professional, University, and Community needs.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

In addition to reading this document, Candidates should familiarize themselves with the University and College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, as well as the UFF-BOR contract. These documents will be made available to all Applicants.

Following are some general criteria and procedures used in all Tenure/Promotion evaluations:

I. The requisite degree for tenure-earning faculty in this Department is a Ph.D. in Physics, or in an acceptable allied Science/Engineering field, from an appropriately accredited program or school.

II. Evaluative judgments regarding Tenure and Promotion are made at three levels within the Department: the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), the Chair and the individual Faculty. The FAC reviews relevant data and makes a recommendation. The Chair independently makes a parallel recommendation. In the case of tenure, a secret ballot of all tenured Faculty is conducted. For Promotion, a secret poll of all Faculty of the same or higher rank is conducted. The candidate's Promotion/Tenure packet, the results of the individual Faculty ballot, FAC's recommendation and the Chair's recommendation are forwarded by the Chair to the College Tenure/Promotion Advisory Committee and the Dean. Before forwarding these materials, the Chair will inform the candidate of the outcomes of this process.

III. The Department of Physics makes its judgments based on perceived national standards for Physics faculty in doctoral-degree-granting institutions. Data are evaluated as appropriate to the case at hand, not according to a priori and necessarily arbitrary prejudgments. As is true in any review procedure, opportunities are provided for exceptions to established criteria, when formally requested by the person under review.

IV. Non-tenured Faculty are given annual feedback regarding their progress toward Tenure/Promotion. It is reasonable to expect that Tenure/Promotion decisions would be consistent with the Annual Evaluation documents, and Candidates should pay special attention to them. The Chair and FAC will carefully consider these annual evaluations, but they are not bound by them.
INFORMATION USED IN EVALUATIONS

In this section of the Guidelines, for each of the three categories of primary importance (Research/Scholarly Activity; Teaching; and Service), we give a representative list of items which are used in determining an overall evaluation for each category. The order of presentation of the items in each category is not to be construed as an effort to assign a relative weight to the various items but, rather, is related to our perceived probability that the items listed will apply to an “average” applicant. For example, in II. Research and other Scholarly Activities (below), Books are listed after Refereed Articles and Grants and Contracts, not because a book would be less important than articles and grants but, rather, because the writing of a book is a less likely occurrence in this category than would be article publications and contracts. The importance of each item must be weighed independently. Nor are these lists to be considered comprehensive; in unusual cases, other items not listed may be important.

I. Teaching:

A. Classroom Teaching:

1. Student evaluations, letters, etc.
2. Peer evaluation, when appropriate
3. The development of new, innovative and useful teaching techniques
4. The development of new courses
5. Evaluation of material prepared for each class, syllabi, reading lists, tests, etc.

B. Supervision and Participation in Dissertation Theses and Honor Committees

1. Supervision of students
   a) Number supervised, completed and in progress.
   b) Quality of theses and dissertations.

2. Committee Memberships
   a) Number served on
   b) Quality of participation

C. Directed Research and Independent Study

1. Supervision of Graduate and Undergraduate Directed Research
2. Supervision of Independent Study

D. Teaching and Intern Supervision

1. Supervision of T.A.s
2. Supervision of Industrial Internships

Comments:

The Department believes teaching and research in a university setting can be strongly interrelated activities. Further, it is believed that effective and valuable teaching can and does occur in settings other than the classroom (e.g. research or practicum supervision). At the same time,
the Department recognizes that most of its instructional activities will occur within a classroom setting. Therefore, commitment to and excellence in classroom teaching is expected. In addition to ordinary measures of teaching quality, as indicated above, the particular character of teaching activities and their place within the Department must be considered as well. Such issues are reflected through evaluations of the degree to which the teaching activities and abilities of the faculty member contribute to primary departmental needs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, the degree to which students are attracted to work with the faculty member, particularly in the area of research direction and committee work on Honors Theses and at the Masters and Ph.D. levels. These numeric and narrative data are a part of the base upon which evaluations of teaching are made by the Department. As in all areas, the overall importance of evaluations in teaching will be determined by the Assigned Faculty Duties in this area.

II. Research and other Scholarly Activities:

A. Articles in refereed professional journals
B. Grants and contracts obtained and/or proposals submitted
C. Papers, symposia, and posters at professional meetings/colloquia, invited talks
D. Books, chapters in books, monographs.
E. Other Research publications:
   Technical reports
   Non-refereed articles
   Book reviews, commentaries etc.

Comments:

The Department’s strong emphasis on research and other scholarly activities is based in part on the belief that active involvement in the creation of knowledge can enhance the dissemination of knowledge (i.e. teaching). Essentially all faculty in the Physics Department have a portion of their assigned duties devoted to research and/or other creative activities. Unless specific exceptions are made, faculty are expected to pursue such activities and will be expected to contribute to the literature in their field. Evaluation of research activity is based upon two primary considerations: quality and quantity:

**Quality.** Quality inevitably refers to professional judgment and it is through relatively standardized processes of professional judgment that this Department reaches its evaluations. With regard to the publication of professional articles, judgements of quality will include, but not be limited to, factors such as: the apparent difficulty in conceptually framing and pursuing the study; publication in refereed journals; the quality of these journals; estimates of the contribution made by the candidate, in the case of multiple author papers; an estimate of the quality of the content of the paper; evaluation comments in letters from appropriately placed outside experts in the field; and the degree to which published works have been cited, as measured, for example by the Scientific Citation Index. Another important area in judgments of research and creative activity includes the seeking and favorable review of grants and contract proposals for scholarly activity, considering availability of funding. The final general area that receives attention is paper presentations at scientific meetings and professional gatherings. These are evaluated on the basis of the level of the meeting and the distinction of the presentation including, especially, invited talks to professional groups.
Quantity. A simple paper count or arithmetical weighting of multiple-author papers, books, and scholarly publications is not sufficient for making evaluations regarding research productivity. Such considerations must also take into account specific aspects of research programs which properly influence the rate of publication. These include, but are not limited to, the amount of support provided for the research, the proportion of assigned duties specifically allocated to research and creative activity, and commonly expected rates of publication in specifically relevant areas of scientific investigation.

III. Service:

A. Departmental Service

1. Departmental committees
2. Sigma Pi Sigma, SPS, etc.

B. Advising (When Assigned)
1. Undergraduate
2. Graduate

C. University Service Outside of Department

1. College, University and SUS committees
2. Other organizations, such as faculty governance groups
3. Collaborative programs with other disciplines

D. Professional

1. Physics Organizations
   a. Professional offices and committees
   b. Regional offices and committees
   c. State and local offices and committees

2. General Scientific, Academic
   a. Reviewing grant proposals for granting agencies
   b. Participation on grant review boards, national policy making
   c. Program evaluation, reviewing grant proposals for granting agencies and similar activities.

E. Community

1. Consultant work with community programs, high school students, etc.
2. Public lectures relevant to discipline
3. Media coverage—community issue oriented papers in the popular press.
4. Activities on behalf of local, state, and federal agencies
5. Judging at Science Fairs

Comments:

Service, both of a professional and public nature, is involved in evaluation of Faculty Perfor-
mance, although typically the amount of assigned duties in this area is small in relation to other areas such as teaching, research and other creative activity. Typically this would consist of some active committee assignments in the Department plus College/University assignments as they might occur. For established faculty we expect a visible amount of professional service outside of the university, such as contributing to professional associations at various levels, holding office in such organizations, reviewing scholarly manuscripts and generally contributing to the overall well-being of the discipline.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR TENURE/PROMOTION

The University and CAS require that faculty be rated annually on a five-point scale in the three categories: Teaching, Research and Service. The five ratings are: Outstanding, Strong, Satisfactory, Poor, and Unsatisfactory. These Annual Evaluations constitute important input to the the Chair and FAC in their process of arriving at an overall rating in each of the three categories for each Tenure/Promotion candidate.

With respect to Tenure/Promotion application, three scenarios can arise: (1) An Assistant Professor without Tenure, applying for Tenure; (2) An Associate Professor without Tenure, applying for Tenure; (3) An Associate Professor with Tenure, applying for Promotion to Full Professor. Following, we discuss the requirements for Tenure and/or Promotion for each of these scenarios:

(1) An Assistant Professor without Tenure, applying for Tenure. It is usual for this case to apply for Promotion to Associate Professor at the same time as application is made for Tenure. To be successful, the applicant must satisfy the following general requirements in the three categories of Teaching, Research and Service: TEACHING - There should be evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching by the candidate, as reflected in student teaching evaluations, Faculty/Departmental evaluations, the quality of instructional materials and teaching techniques used, etc; RESEARCH - There must be evidence of a body of work of sufficient quality and quantity which can reasonably be interpreted as the beginning of a national reputation for significant and creative contributions to the candidate’s field of research, and there must be evidence of the promise of continued growth; SERVICE - There must be evidence of a positive contribution to the affairs and concerns of the Department, College and/or University. In terms of overall ratings in these three categories, the candidate must be rated “Outstanding” in either Research or Teaching, and at least “Strong” in the other; the candidate must be rated at least “Satisfactory” in Service.

(2) An Associate Professor without Tenure, applying for Tenure. This would be the case where someone is hired at the Associate Professor level, without Tenure. In this case, while it is possible to apply simultaneously for Promotion to Full Professor, this is not usually the case. For the case where Promotion is not applied for, the requirements are the same as those for the preceding scenario (1):

(3) An Associate Professor with Tenure, applying for Promotion to Full Professor. To be successful, the applicant must satisfy the following general requirements in the three categories of Teaching, Research and Service: TEACHING - There should be evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching by the candidate, as reflected in student teaching evaluations, Faculty/Departmental evaluations, the quality of instructional
materials and teaching techniques used, etc; RESEARCH - For promotion to Professor, an established national and/or international reputation is expected, as well as an indication of sustained high-quality work; SERVICE - A candidate is expected to make positive contributions to both the University and the Profession. In terms of overall ratings in these three categories, as for scenario (1), the candidate must be rated "Outstanding" in either Research or Teaching, and at least "Strong" in the other; the candidate must be rated at least "Strong" in Service.

Faculty Members evaluate all Tenure/Promotion Candidates via secret polls: Tenured Faculty of the Department are eligible to vote on the granting of tenure; Associate and Full Professors are eligible to vote on the promotion of a Candidate to the Associate Professor rank; and, Full Professors are eligible to vote on the promotion of a Candidate to the Professor rank. These results of these polls are part of the data collected for Tenure and/or Promotion.

OUTSIDE REVIEW

Outside review of the credentials of all Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion is required. This review will comply with the guidelines promulgated by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. This outside review will be available to the Tenured Faculty, FAC and the Chair.