

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY POLICIES AND GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Revised June 17, 2011

INTRODUCTION

General policies and guidelines concerning Tenure and Promotion (T&P) are provided in the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/handbook/>) and should be carefully reviewed by all departmental faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion. The current document is intended as a supplement to the Faculty Handbook, providing guidelines that are specific to faculty in the Department of Geology and Geography (GL/GY). The text herein describes departmental expectations for faculty in their academic mission, summarizes criteria used to evaluate faculty performance, and offers recommendations intended to help faculty colleagues succeed in the tenure and promotion process. Although the focus is on tenure and promotion, the evaluative criteria outlined herein are generally applicable to annual merit evaluations and, hence, should be of benefit to the entire faculty.

Notably, Geology and Geography, although united in their focus on the Earth, are very broad fields, and the expertise of our faculty spans a broad range of disciplines that include social sciences as well as natural sciences. We embrace this diversity and account for it in this document.

The GL/GY Chair and the GL/GY Tenure and Promotion Committee are responsible for advising the candidate on preparation of the dossier, undertaking aspects of dossier preparation (including solicitation of letters), and preparing an objective summary of deliberations. Procedural questions about T&P should be addressed to the GL/GY T&P Chair. The T&P Chair and Committee members serve advisory and procedural roles and do not pass judgments on the actions of the Candidate except in their capacity as individual voting faculty members. A senior-faculty member is appointed as a Mentor to represent and advise the Candidate.

CONTENTS

I. Faculty mission and general expectations

II. Effective Teaching

A. Elements of Instruction

B. Evaluation of Teaching

1. Student evaluations

2. Peer evaluations

3. Research instruction

4. Other

III. Research Scholarship

A. Research Productivity

1. Research publications

2. Research funding

3. Other Scholarly Activities Leading to Professional Development

B. Evaluation of Scholarly Research

IV. Outreach

A. Goals of Faculty Outreach

B. Evaluation of Outreach

V. Service

A. Faculty Service Expectations

B. Evaluation of Service

VI. Third-year review

VII. Tenure Review

VIII. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

IX. Promotion to Rank of Full Professor

X. Recommendations for Documenting, Improving, and Maintaining Teaching Effectiveness

XI. Recommendations for Developing and Maintaining Productive Research Programs

I. FACULTY MISSION AND GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

The mission of the Department of Geology and Geography, parallel to that of Auburn University and the College of Sciences and Mathematics, calls for the integration of Teaching, Research, and Service/Outreach. Teaching and Research traditionally have been the primary responsibilities of our faculty and, thus, normally are emphasized in the faculty evaluation process.

The Department of Geology and Geography strives to maintain the tradition of Teaching excellence that arose early in the history of our programs. Our main goal is to provide contemporary instruction, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, that will allow our students to compete successfully in the job market or to pursue advanced degrees. To this end, we expect all faculty members to demonstrate *effective teaching*.

Classroom instruction alone cannot justify a modern Geology and Geography Department. To remain relevant in the 21st Century and to ensure the competitive standing of our students, we also need to serve as a fountain of discovery and new knowledge by engaging in original research. Hence, we also expect every member of our faculty to maintain *active and productive research programs*.

Outreach and Service also are valued endeavors considered in departmental tenure and promotion decisions. *Outreach*, defined as community involvement related to a faculty member's area(s) of expertise, traditionally has been a voluntary and subordinate facet of faculty workload. However, with the increased significance placed on outreach by research funding agencies in recent years, we recognize that outreach activities may be, in some cases, an integral part of instructional and research efforts. *Service*, defined as the involvement of a faculty member in the delegated administrative work of the Department, College, University, or in a broader Professional or Public realm, is a duty for all faculty members. As described below, departmental expectations for service vary with faculty rank as well as with concurrent teaching and research assignments.

In arriving at Tenure and Promotion decisions at the department level, the candidate's cumulative effort in all mission areas is evaluated. Weight given to each area varies depending on assigned distribution of effort (e.g., teaching loads, etc.). The overarching criterion for a positive recommendation is concrete evidence that the candidate has achieved rank-commensurate distinction as a teacher and scholar.

II. EFFECTIVE TEACHING

All faculty members recommended for tenure or promotion in the Department of Geology and Geography must teach effectively. This is a minimum requirement. While effective teaching by itself does not lead to a positive recommendation, ineffective teaching leads to a negative recommendation and denial of tenure or promotion.

A. Elements of Instruction

Teaching in the Department includes both course instruction and research instruction. *Course instruction* refers to the teaching of regular courses, including those assigned by the Department Chair and any additional courses offered voluntarily; it excludes courses that lack a significant classroom component (e.g., undergraduate or graduate thesis, research methods, directed readings, etc.). The *assigned* course instructional load for faculty members depends on other duties (e.g., research, research instruction, outreach, and service duties), but normally involves two courses per term (6 to 8 credit hours). All faculty members are expected to provide effective course instruction. Effectiveness in course instruction refers to the ability to communicate, in a clear and engaging manner, an up-to-date body of knowledge that is commensurate with both the stated course objectives (as outlined in course syllabi) and the background of the students enrolled. It encompasses all aspects of a course, which may include lab-instructor supervision, as well as classroom, laboratory, and field instruction.

All faculty members also are expected to provide effective research instruction. *Research instruction* involves the direction of undergraduate and graduate student thesis research, guidance of other student projects associated with research-oriented courses (e.g., Research Methods, Directed Readings, Directed Studies, etc.), and substantive service on thesis committees chaired by faculty colleagues. Effectiveness in research instruction refers to the ability to recruit and mentor student research supervisees and to guide student researchers to timely thesis or project completion.

B. Evaluation of Teaching

Dossiers prepared by candidates for tenure and/or promotion must include evidence of teaching effectiveness. In light of the disciplinary diversity of Department faculty, we measure teaching effectiveness in terms of a judicious but not necessarily uniform combination of course and research instruction. Principle criteria employed by departmental review committees in evaluating instruction include the following.

1. Student teaching evaluations

These include numerical scores and written comments derived using Auburn University's standard teaching evaluation forms, and they must be representative of all courses routinely taught by the candidate. Student evaluations are used primarily to judge presentation methods, organization, fairness, and instructor-student interactions. Overall favorable evaluations are required for tenure and/or promotion. Student teaching evaluations should be administered for all courses taught every semester.

2. Peer evaluations of course instruction

These reports should be periodically solicited from senior faculty colleagues who are most familiar with the subject by the candidate in consultation with the Department Chair and T&P Committee. They should be representative of the various types of courses taught and can be prepared using the standard departmental peer evaluation of teaching form or as a letter submitted to the Department Chair. Peer evaluations can include commentary on lecture style and clarity, observed instructor-student interaction, and adequacy of exams and the syllabus, but should focus on the level, quality, and modernity of course content. Peer evaluations that are overall favorable are required to receive a positive committee recommendation.

3. Extent and quality of research instruction

These parameters are evaluated based on: a) number of students supervised by the candidate; b) number of student supervisees who have successfully completed their projects; c) magnitude of student projects (MS theses, undergraduate theses, one-term course projects, etc.); and d) feedback on mentoring performance from colleagues who have served with the candidate on thesis committees or who are otherwise familiar with the research products of the candidate's advisees.

4. Other considerations

In addition to the above criteria, several other elements are considered laudatory in evaluating teaching effectiveness.

- a. Documented actions taken by the candidate to (i) develop new courses (including online or distance education courses) that serve an obvious curriculum need or (ii) revitalize existing courses by introducing new material or employing innovative teaching methods that enhance learning in the classroom, laboratory, and field.

- b. Departmental, college, university, and society awards received for teaching or student mentoring.
- c. Grants received for enhancement of teaching.
- d. Quantity and quality of publications that specifically address pedagogy.

III. RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP

A vibrant Research environment is essential for the success of any modern academic unit within the Sciences. A culture of strong research activity and scholarship, foundations of discovery, and acquisition of new knowledge, are essential to the Research Mission of GL/GY. Productivity in research is important because it demonstrates faculty significance to external audiences, enhances educational opportunities for GL/GY students, increases the national and international profile of the faculty, and advances the subdisciplines represented within GL/GY. Our Department values research, and all of our faculty members are expected to be productive researchers. Productive research among our faculty is identified by success in publication, quest for external research funding, and other scholarly activities.

A. Research Productivity

1. Research Publications

Effective research must lead to publication in scholarly outlets (peer-reviewed journals, books, or book articles, etc.). All of our faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly publication. Evaluations of faculty effort consider both the quantity and quality of publications.

Although it is understood that a candidate's record may include publications of research initiated before arrival at Auburn University, the record is expected to show continuity of research through the inclusion of recent research performed at Auburn University. Expected publication rate varies with research area but in all cases should manifest continued professional growth. As a general guideline using refereed journal articles as the "standard," we expect an *average* publication rate of at least one paper per year. Higher rates are expected for faculty with comparatively light teaching loads. We encourage collaborative interdisciplinary research and recognize that multiple-author publications are common and necessary in some disciplines. In cases where multiple authorship is justified, credit will be evaluated based on the relative role played by the faculty member and their students in both the conduct of the research and manuscript preparation.

Quality of publications is judged based on independent criteria, including the nature and prestige of the publication outlets, numbers of citations, and peer review. Although books may be an important and meritorious publication outlet employed by our faculty in the social sciences, peer-reviewed journals are the standard outlet for geology and physical geography research. Publications viewed most favorably are those appearing in widely circulated, refereed, national or international journals, particularly those with high impact factors (e.g., Institute of Scientific Information, ISI, journals). Articles published in regional journals or as book chapters also are looked upon favorably, provided they have undergone adequate peer review. Although peer-reviewed articles are expected, “gray” literature (in the form of field-trip guidebooks, geologic maps, state and federal survey publications, etc.) may be a necessary component of some faculty member’s research and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, while positively reflecting upon the faculty member’s research efforts, other types of publications, including editorials and book reviews in scholarly journals, encyclopedia contributions, conference abstracts, etc., will carry significantly less weight than books and peer-reviewed articles. Publication quality also will be measured from evidence provided in external letters from expert colleagues and letters from faculty colleagues most familiar with the candidate's discipline and research methodologies.

2. Research Funding

Vibrant and productive scholarly programs require funding to support the research efforts of faculty and their graduate and undergraduate student advisees. All faculty members are expected to compete successfully for extramural research funding. Evaluations of faculty grantsmanship consider the sources, types, and level of research support received.

Research support can be sought from national agencies (NSF, DOE, etc.), scientific or professional societies (ACS, NGS, etc.), industry, and internal sources, and it may be provided in the form of monetary grants or in-kind aid (goods or services). Credit is given for all forms of support from any source, but solicitation of funding from external agencies is expected. Weight is preferentially given to grants competitively awarded by external funding agencies, especially those that provide indirect costs and/or provide student support.

We recognize that collaborative grant proposals are common and necessary in some disciplines. In cases where multiple investigators are justified, credit will be evaluated based the relative role played by the faculty member in project formulation, proposal preparation, and subsequent conduct of the research. Credit also is given to

faculty members who guide their undergraduate and graduate advisees in the acquisition of student grants-in-aid of research.

We recognize that the number of grants and the level of Research funding required to support productive scholarship vary among disciplines and research programs. As a general guideline, faculty members seeking tenure or promotion should prepare and submit new or continuation grant applications at a rate necessary to quickly establish and then to maintain adequate extramural funding for their research programs. Higher levels of funding are expected for faculty with comparatively light teaching loads. Whether or not a candidate for tenure or promotion has achieved an adequate level of research funding (i.e., a level commensurate with the candidate's discipline and assigned distribution of effort) will be determined in part by the content of letters supplied by both external evaluators (see <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies.html> for guidelines for selecting external evaluators) and departmental colleagues within the candidate's discipline.

3. Other Scholarly Activities Leading to Professional Development

In judging research scholarship, we also seek other evidence of scholarly activity and peer recognition thereof. These activities include voluntary or invited presentations at professional meetings and other universities, leadership of formal field trips, participation in workshops, editorial duties, consulting, development of intellectual property (e.g., patents), and other professional pursuits. Professional consulting activities are also viewed favorably, provided that they enhance, rather than interfere with, teaching and research programs.

B. Evaluation of Scholarly Research

In preparing their dossiers for Tenure and/or Promotion, it is incumbent upon candidates to clearly demonstrate the quality and quantity of their research. In light of the disciplinary diversity of GL/GY faculty, we measure research productivity in terms of a judicious but not necessarily uniform combination of publication record, grantsmanship, and other scholarly activities. In most cases, we will emphasize what the candidate has accomplished *while in residence at Auburn University*, although this emphasis may vary depending on prior service. Principle criteria employed by departmental review committees in evaluating research productivity include the following.

- (1) Quality and quantity of publications. Evaluations of quality will consider the nature of publication outlets as described above.

- (2) Success in securing extramural funding for research or related outreach activities. Sources and levels of funding will be considered in the context of the candidate's discipline.
- (3) Presentations of scholarly work given at regional, national, and international meetings.
- (4) Invitations to participate in professional symposia and workshops, to lead field trips, and to present lectures at other institutions.
- (5) Invitations to serve as editor or on editorial boards of professional publications and on review panels of funding agencies.
- (6) Invitations to serve as a reviewer of research proposals and manuscripts.
- (7) Written reports from Auburn University faculty members most familiar with the candidate's work.
- (8) Written opinions from distinguished scientists and/or educators outside the University (external evaluators) who are familiar with the candidate's research area and who can judge his/her achievement level and promise.
- (9) Departmental, college, university, and society awards received in recognition of research.
- (10) Development of intellectual property, including patents applied for and awarded.

IV. OUTREACH

A. Goals of Faculty Outreach

As a land-grant institution, Auburn University is committed to public service. In contrast to service that is episodic in nature, outreach is programmatic and occurs when a faculty member uses their scholarly expertise to address a public need beyond the confines of the university. Outreach activities must be linked to the mission of the Department, College, and University and generate new knowledge in the candidate's discipline or among an external audience.

While new faculty members should focus their efforts primarily on teaching and research, productive outreach activities will be viewed positively in the review process, particularly when they lead to external funding for students and research and to peer-reviewed publications.

B. Evaluation of Outreach

The quality of the candidate's outreach activities will be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria.

- (1) Success in securing internal and external support for outreach efforts.
- (2) Quality and quantity of publications in peer-reviewed outlets and presentations that derive from outreach activities.
- (3) Written evaluations from Auburn University faculty members familiar with the candidate's outreach work.
- (4) Written opinions from other individuals capable of judging the breadth and depth of the impact of outreach efforts (teachers, community leaders, etc.) on targeted beneficiaries.
- (5) Awards received in recognition of outreach efforts.

V. SERVICE

A. Faculty Service Expectations

In addition to providing professional service as outlined in section III, all faculty members are expected to be active citizens of the Department, College, and University. This involves university governance (e.g., service on the Faculty Senate), substantive service on standing and adhoc committees at the Department, College, and/or University levels, academic advisement and recruitment of students, supervision of student organizations, and periodic activities intended to inform K-12 students and other members of the community.

In order to facilitate their development of effective instructional and research programs, junior faculty members (i.e., assistant professors) are normally given a reduced service load. Service responsibilities expand with increased academic rank. All

faculty members have a stake in the successful operation of the Department, College, and University and thus are expected to perform service duties conscientiously. Such service should be commensurate with expectations of collegiality as defined in the Auburn University Faculty Handbook.

B. Evaluation of Service

Dossiers for tenure and/or promotion should reflect the extent and quality of service. Criteria employed in the evaluation of service vary with faculty rank and career stage and may include the following.

- (1) Number and productivity of Departmental, College, and University committees on which the faculty member serves.
- (2) Leadership responsibilities assumed in committee service.
- (3) Written evaluations from Auburn University faculty members familiar with the candidate's committee work.
- (4) Other roles in University governance (e.g., service on the Faculty Senate).
- (5) Extent and quality of student academic advising and supervision of student organizations.
- (6) Frequency and magnitude of service in Departmental and College K-12 outreach and recruiting activities (e.g., Science Olympiad, Y.E.S. camps, B.E.S.T. Robotics competition, Auburn University Explore, Talons, *Ask Aubie* guest writer, etc.).
- (7) Frequency and magnitude of community service activities related to the mission of our Department (e.g., presentations to K-12 classes, scout groups, and other civic organizations).

VI. THIRD-YEAR REVIEW

The 3rd-year review normally will occur no later than 32 months after initial appointment, generally before April 30 of the faculty member's 3rd year of residence (timing may vary depending on prior service). The untenured faculty member will submit

the packet and supplemental information for review by the tenured faculty who will then meet and vote. The T&P committee will write a report summarizing the meeting, and the GL/GY Chair will write a separate evaluation describing the Candidate's progress towards T&P. The untenured faculty member will then meet with the GL/GY Chair, Mentor, and T&P Chair to discuss the outcome of the vote and meeting and to receive an oral summary of the T&P report of the faculty meeting. If the review is determined to reflect substandard progress toward tenure, a letter of non-continuation will be issued.

VII. TENURE REVIEW

According to the Auburn University Handbook, there is no set schedule for tenure, but usually 4 years of service are required to demonstrate competency for tenure. A Candidate only has 2 opportunities to be considered for tenure, whereas there is no limit to the number times the Candidate may be considered for promotion. A bid for tenure prior to the 4th complete year of service is considered "early" and a candidate's dossier must attest to exceptional performance that warrants early consideration for tenure (see Auburn University Faculty Handbook).

Assistant Professors can go forward for consideration for promotion and tenure at the end of their 4th year or end of 5th year (typical), but it is their responsibility to declare their intentions to the GL/GY Chair and T&P Chair. For a 6th-year candidate the process will be automatically started by the GL/GY Chair and the T&P Chair. All T&P bids will use the following procedure:

1. During the spring semester of the year of consideration, the Candidate contacts the GL/GY Chair and T&P Chair to start the process.
2. The Candidate submits the dossier and supplemental information to the T&P committee, who will review the packet and allow the Candidate to revise it as needed.
3. The packet is sent to outside evaluators chosen using the procedures outlined by the Provost (see <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies.html>).
4. The GL/GY Chair requests updated dossiers & supplemental information from the Candidate (usually in September), which will be distributed, along with the outside evaluations, to the tenured faculty for review.
5. The tenured faculty meet and discuss the candidate's readiness for promotion and tenure.
6. The Candidate's packet is discussed and a vote is made by the tenured faculty.
7. Within 1 week of the tenure meeting, the Candidate meets with the GL/GY Chair, Mentor, and T&P Chair to discuss the outcome of the meeting. The Candidate is provided the vote and an oral summary of the meeting. If the candidate decides

to proceed, then the packet will be forwarded to the Dean and eventually to the University T&P Committee. Alternatively, if the Candidate withdraws their packet prior to submission to the Dean, then it will not count as one of the two tenure bids.

VIII. PROMOTION TO RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, a Candidate must demonstrate a high degree of overall academic achievement, and meritorious contributions toward Teaching, Research and Service. Meritorious activities include, but are not limited to: 1) development of a rigorous instructional program at both the graduate and undergraduate levels; 2) development of an independent and nationally recognized research program defined by peer-reviewed scientific articles; 3) training of graduate students; 4) acquisition of extramural funding; and 5) dedication to service. Scholarly publications and acquisition of extramural funding while at Auburn is essential, and the research program must be recognized as meritorious and important beyond Auburn. The Candidate must demonstrate evidence of an emerging national or international reputation in their discipline and the potential to ultimately advance to rank of Full Professor. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review and recognition. Of particular importance is a consistent level of programmatic growth over a substantial portion of the promotion review period (i.e., over multiple years).

Assigned appointment levels and associated workloads vary among faculty members in GL/GY, so both quality and quantity of contributions by the Candidate are to be considered in the context of his/her responsibilities. The procedure for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is ordinarily joined to the process of consideration for Tenure. For most candidates a minimum of four (4) years is needed to demonstrate and document sufficient time in rank to support a promotion bid. Thus, most candidates are initially considered after 5 years in rank. To begin the process of promotion consideration, the Candidate should confer with the GL/GY Chair and the T&P Chair.

Candidates for Promotion to rank of Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate consistent progress toward excellence in teaching. Exemplary teaching and instructional scholarship is expected of all GL/GY faculty members. Successful candidates are expected to demonstrate a commitment to the instructional mission by regular participation in both graduate and undergraduate education in both formal (classroom) and informal settings (i.e., directed study, undergraduate and graduate research). Education of graduate students is a fundamental aspect of GL/GY teaching,

and this is weighted heavily in promotion considerations; effective direction of graduate students as major advisor is expected. Meritorious teaching alone will not qualify a candidate for promotion, although evidence of a strong commitment is required, but ineffective teaching can contribute to denial of promotion. Daily teaching activities, curriculum development, and course management are all standard elements of a Candidate's instructional load. Evidence that the Candidate has advanced, and will continue to grow through scholarly contributions and pedagogical improvements is a minimum requirement for promotion to Associate Professor. General teaching ability and scholarly productivity is assessed through a) student evaluations, b) peer reviews, c) student letters, d) review of scholarly products such as examples of innovative course modifications or mechanisms (e.g., demonstrations, field or laboratory activities, etc.) developed by the Candidate, and e) input from the GL/GY Chair. Meritorious performance is evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts, such as pedagogical articles, grants, and awards.

Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor are expected to develop a body of work that documents achievement of distinction in scholarship and research. GL/GY is home to a broad spectrum of disciplines, each with a unique set of research characteristics and scholarly outlets. The Faculty values the differences among the disciplines and makes every effort to ensure that promotion materials are considered within the appropriate framework. The Candidate must understand, however, that promotion is not a discipline-specific achievement, but rather one that ultimately represents a Department-wide recognition of meritorious performance at Auburn. Publication quality and quantity is a strong indicator of effort and success in research and a rate of 1 to 2 scholarly products per year is expected, with preference given to individuals who exhibit a steady progression of productivity. Laudatory research accomplishments for promotion to Associate Professor are explained above in Section IIIB. Clear evidence of sustained growth and maturation of a Candidate's research program is expected for promotion to rank of Associate Professor. A steady increase in publication productivity and extramural funding are clear indicators of research scholarship and provides unequivocal evidence of program development. An initial lag period may occur for new faculty both in terms of the time required to generate publishable data and for publication time lines. Candidates are strongly advised to be aware of these lags and to incorporate them into research program planning. Failure to do so can be viewed as an inability to function effectively within the existing GL/GY infrastructure. Starting in their first year, new faculty members are expected to aggressively seek extramural funding to support their research program. Failure to acquire competitive extramural funding is viewed as a potential liability toward developing and maintaining a productive research program.

Meritorious service to the Department, University and broader academic community is an integral component for promotion to Associate Professor and is assessed by review of the service section of the Candidate's dossier. Strong dossiers typically show evidence of service activity such as, but not limited to that which is outlined in Section IVB, with activity levels increasing over time. In this regard, comments from faculty members sharing committee work along with input from external reviewers evaluating service can carry significant weight during promotion deliberations.

IX. PROMOTION TO RANK OF FULL PROFESSOR

Criteria used to judge suitability for promotion to rank of Full Professor are generally similar to those stated above for promotion to Associate Professor, although the level of rigor is significantly higher. The promise that is implicit in the recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor must have been fulfilled. Consideration for promotion to Full Professor normally occurs no earlier than 5 years after promotion to Associate Professor. By this time, student and faculty evaluations will be sufficient to assess the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and scholar by the criteria listed in previous sections. Promotion to Professor is based on merit as documented by a sustained and high-quality commitment to teaching, research, and service beyond that of the Associate Professor rank for a minimum of 4 years. A strong national and international reputation in at least 1 of these areas is expected. Assessment of productivity and contributions should focus on recent efforts at the rank of Associate Professor; older contributions made at the Assistant rank are less important for promotion to Full Professor. Promotion to Professor, therefore, is primarily a function of specific scholarly contributions and general productivity, and not an entitlement after time in rank.

A strong teaching program is expected. Strong teaching alone likely will not justify promotion to Full Professor, but a weak teaching program will reflect negatively on the Candidate. Significant participation in the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs is a requirement for promotion to Professor. The Candidate must be an active participant in the graduate program, which involves teaching of graduate courses and successful mentoring of graduate students as an advisor, committee member, or both.

Research excellence and maturity, and a strong reputation are the most typical route of promotion to Professor. The successful Candidate will have maintained an extramurally funded research program, and produced a minimum of 1 to 3 high-quality scholarly products per year. For promotion to the rank of Full Professor the candidate

will have accumulated multiple extramurally funded grants and high-quality peer-reviewed publications during the review period. Increased emphasis is placed on publication quality and quantity, however, rather than the number or dollar amount of grants received. Other contributions, such as articles or book chapters that profoundly change a research field should be weighed appropriately in a promotion bid. Candidates for Professor are expected to be leaders in their discipline with several significant contributions to that field. As their international reputation grows in research (or, less typically, teaching or service), their dossier will usually include an increased non-Auburn service component (e.g., review of manuscripts or proposal, proposal panels, major or multiple offices held in scientific societies, invited presentations, public comments on policy, etc). As a result, viable candidates usually will have a very strong dossier in research and teaching/service. A major difference for promotion to the rank of Full Professor is the weight given to external letters, solicited from the GL/GY Chair and Chair of the P&T committee, used to assess a Candidate's national and international reputation. Such external evaluations provide a critical source of information pertaining to the Candidate's scholarly contributions to the discipline. Likewise, a Candidate's service activity outside of Auburn reflects the degree to which the Candidate's opinions, insights, and contributions are valued by the community at large. Thus, external letters and service contributions are typically weighted much more heavily for promotion to rank of Professor because they provide a useful evaluation of one's academic reputation.

In the service and outreach categories, we expect that the candidate will have exhibited a high degree of initiative, leadership, and unselfish devotion to the common good of the Department, College, University, and profession. However, the main factors in arriving at a departmental decision for promotion to the rank of Professor are distinction in teaching and distinction in research. Furthermore, the Candidate's reputation and impact are readily assessed if their contributions are recognized by a broad community rather than a narrow and specialized group. Finally, Full Professors are expected to act as leaders in GL/GY and should actively participate in Departmental, College, and University service to a greater degree than faculty in lower ranks. They are expected to promote collegiality and foster the development of the junior faculty. They should promote a dynamic atmosphere to an ever-improving Department, rather than allowing or perpetuating stagnation of GL/GY programs or initiatives.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOCUMENTING, IMPROVING, AND MAINTAINING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The following recommendations are made to all faculty members, but are particularly crucial for those seeking tenure and/or promotion.

- (1) Keep course materials and delivery methods up-to-date.
- (2) Administer student teaching evaluations for all courses taught every semester. Read student comments carefully, discuss them with the Department Chair if warranted, and act on constructive criticism.
- (3) In consultation with the Department Chair, solicit regular peer reviews of teaching. Reviews are most useful if provided by colleagues who work in closely related disciplines. Consider peer reviews carefully and act on constructive criticism.
- (4) Utilize other campus resources intended to improve teaching effectiveness. In particular, Auburn University's Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning provides a variety of useful services, including pedagogical workshops and in-class small group instructional feedback (SGIF).
- (5) Attempt to attract and successfully direct the research of at least one or two students (graduate or undergraduate) per year. Mentor students by providing clear guidance and timely feedback.
- (6) Seek advice on course and research instruction from the Department Chair or other faculty colleagues, particularly those known for effective teaching.
- (7) Interact positively with students in your classes and in your research group. Be demanding, but fair, accessible, respectful, and congenial.

XI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPING AND MAINTAINING PRODUCTIVE RESEARCH PROGRAMS

- (1) Get research programs started early. New faculty should plan to initiate work themselves. Students cannot be depended on for early publishable results; they will need time and faculty guidance to become productive researchers.

- (2) Publish early and regularly. Success in the tenure and promotion process depends heavily on favorable recognition of published work by outside reviewers. If at first you don't succeed, keep trying. Seek the advice of senior faculty on writing and publication outlet selection.
- (3) Seek grant funding early and regularly. New faculty should submit proposals for "starter" grants as soon as possible (in some cases, it may be possible to submit before arriving on campus). Subsequently, proposals should be prepared and submitted to funding agencies on a regular basis. In cases where funding is initially denied, consider peer reviewer comments carefully and revise and resubmit the proposal at the next opportunity. To improve your proposals, seek the advice of senior colleagues, request assistance from College staff members who specialize in grant writing, and participate in available institutional grant-writing workshops.
- (4) Cultivate collaborative research relationships. While all faculty members are expected to establish credentials as independent researchers, collaborative research can be beneficial and may be required in certain areas. Proactively explore and foster mutually advantageous research collaboration with University and external colleagues.
- (5) Attend and present research results at professional meetings and other forums. Participation at appropriate professional meetings aids in establishing a research reputation among peers. Plan to participate in one or more professional meetings annually, including those at the national level. Accept invitations to speak at other institutions and to participate in workshops and symposia.
- (6) Establish a record of professional service. Faculty members build their reputations for research and leadership through service as an editor or associate editor, on committees and councils of professional societies, as a reviewer of manuscripts and proposals, and in other professional capacities. Because service activities can be time consuming, invitations to serve should be considered judiciously in the context of other faculty duties and expectations.