

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY, ENVIRONMENT, AND PLANNING
Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (August 2017)

This Criteria Statement is designed to provide guidance for evaluation for reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP) for tenure-track faculty in the Department of Geography, Environment, and Planning (GEP) as they move through the process, and for the RTP committees at each level of review from Department through University and the President.

Due to the interdisciplinary nature of GEP, our faculty possess diverse expertise and interests. Moreover, some of our faculty members are hired for specific positions, or they may be asked to serve in administrative positions early during the tenure and promotion process. These duties may result in assigned or release time from teaching. Therefore, each faculty member will likely have a different mix of responsibilities that requires flexibility in defining criteria for an individual's RTP evaluation.

Evaluation for RTP at SSU is judged on the basis of four areas of accomplishment as outlined in the university RTP policy: excellence in teaching, excellence in scholarship, and excellence in university and community service. The GEP RTP Committee evaluation will be consistent with these University categories. New and continuing faculty members will be informed of the expectations of the Department at the time of hire and throughout the probationary years in the Department-level RTP Committee evaluation document. If a candidate has allocated far greater effort to one of these categories in a given review cycle, it is incumbent on the candidate to provide a rationale in her or his self-assessment so the committee can guide the candidate in reaching RTP expectations by time of promotion.

Due to the broad nature of GEP, there may be overlap between teaching, research, and service activities that can be considered for RTP purposes. For example, some faculty will instruct student interns in their work as part of a research grant, or to fulfill other contracts. This could be considered a combination of teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, and community service. It is expected that the candidate will make a clear argument for considering multiple RTP areas within a single activity in his or her self-evaluation document.

Teaching Effectiveness

Effectiveness in teaching is a primary consideration in evaluating candidate's performance. It should be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as through numerical SETE scores, qualitative SETE comments, and peer teaching reviews, as outlined by university RTP policy. The Department takes into account that SETE scores may be lower for certain types of courses, such as new courses and required courses that students find particularly challenging. The Department RTP committee will evaluate SETE scores within the context of the teaching experience of the department.

Effectiveness of teaching will also be measured by peer observations. Peer observations will be conducted by faculty members within GEP and other departments. Observations will address teaching style and methods, learning objectives, course content, methods to evaluate student performance, and student engagement. Recommendations for improvement will be made clear in peer observations.

Faculty members may also have teaching-related duties such as supervising student interns and graduate students. Effectiveness in these other teaching-related activities will be taken into account by the individual RTP committees and may also be addressed by the candidate in her or his Self-assessment of Teaching.

A. Teaching expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Student evaluations will be measured quantitatively. Department teaching goals are as follows: For each class being evaluated by time of tenure and promotion, the Department expects scores on at least 12 of the 14 individual evaluation questions should average at least 4.0. Each class' overall average score should be 4.2 or above. Probationary faculty members will be expected to address both quantitative and qualitative issues raised in their review during the probationary period, such as times the course was taught, improvement in scores through sequential reviews, and extenuating circumstances that caused a year of low scores. We value candidates' appraisal of the meaningfulness of their student ratings.

Candidates are required to include a table showing SETE scores for all categories in all courses taught and across all years.

The department greatly values mentoring of undergraduates and expects faculty to engage undergraduates in their research, teaching, and/or service.

B. Teaching expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

Faculty members are expected to maintain excellence in teaching based on both quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Achievements

Acceptable scholarship may take a variety of forms depending on the candidate's discipline. The Department's RTP committee takes a holistic approach to evaluating scholarly activity, weighing the quality, originality, and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

In addition to publication in peer-reviewed academic journals, other types of scholarship by candidates whose field is applied and professional in character will be valued in the RTP

process, provided it evidences high-quality data collection and analysis methods and is disseminated publicly so that it furthers the development of knowledge in the discipline and/or improved professional practice.

For both tenure and promotion, we encourage our faculty to contribute to the discipline through activities such as attendance and research presentation at regional, national and international meetings in the discipline or their sub-discipline, provide peer-review for scholarly journals and grants in their field of expertise, serve on association committees or executive boards, editorial boards of discipline specific journals, and on occasion take on leadership roles such as association president or editor of a journal.

TIER 1 products reflect original work conducted primarily by the candidate (i.e., first author papers, chapters and books). For journal articles to count toward Tier 1 products they must come from journals with an established impact factor*. Candidates will provide the impact factor score and the JRC ranking for each journal publication in their self-assessment. Candidates engaged in developing plans, policies and/or legal briefs as part of their scholarship must provide details on the analysis, review, and dissemination of the work and why it merits placement in TIER 1 vs. the other tiers. TIER 1 also includes external funding from competitive grant sources. Other products could include patents, inventions, and non-print media (i.e. videos, software) related to the candidate's research.

TIER II includes products to which the candidate contributes, but is not the principal author or investigator. Items from this category include books, chapters, papers and other products for which the candidate is a contributing author. This category also includes non-competitive funding sources, such as some contracts. Service on an editorial board for a journal is also included here due to the substantial time investment and contribution involved and the requirement of staying current in a given field.

If the work has not been subject to traditional peer review, and the candidate thinks it should be considered for this or another category, the candidate shall document those types of review to which the work has been subjected.

TIER III products are works in progress leading up to tenure and promotion. This tier provides candidates and committee members with a sense for work products that are in process, such as manuscripts and grant proposals under review. The expectation is that some of these items will become either TIER I or TIER II products in time for tenure and promotion decisions (see below). TIER III also includes products or work that is in support of TIER I and II categories. For example, an intramural grant is considered to be a TIER III item but may lead to products such as peer-reviewed publications in the other tiers. Likewise, a presentation at a conference may lead to a TIER I or TIER II product. Also included in this category are papers that are not peer-reviewed or are published in journals that lack an impact factor (these might include magazines or publications in newer open-access journals not yet assigned an impact factor).

TIER I

- Published monograph or book on candidate's research.
- Text book.
- In-press or published first (or corresponding author*) article in peer-reviewed journal with an established impact factor** or first author, peer-reviewed book chapter.
- Funded competitive (peer-reviewed) grant from state, national or international agency foundation, or granting organization.
- Publications appropriate to the professional discipline prepared for public agencies, such as public policy studies, plans, and ordinances. These publications shall be internally reviewed by the public agency and have public distribution.
- Work presented in non-print media (i.e., videos, software) that is peer reviewed in the candidate's field and is publicly distributed widely.

TIER II

- In-press or published contributing-author article in peer-reviewed journal with an impact factor or a peer-reviewed book chapter.
- Funded competitive grant from local or regional agency.
- Professional reports and other projects using rigorous research methods that are conducted for clients and community partners.
- Service on the editorial board of a journal.
- Peer-reviewed papers presented at conferences.

TIER III

- In-press or published first or contributing author articles in peer-reviewed journal with no impact factor or non-peer-reviewed book chapters
- Research reports or scholarly papers presented at conferences.
- Funded internal grant.
- Consultancies, products or inventions that relate directly to their research.
- Submitted research proposals to competitive granting institutions.
- Implementation of a training workshop in your research field.
- Participation in professional meetings as speaker, committee member, or organizer.
- Service as a reviewer for scholarly journals or membership in review panel for research grants.
- Awards, honors, or invited speaking engagements.
- Contracts related to research.
- Supervision of student researchers engaged in candidate's research.
- Intramural grant.

* Candidates must provide a summary of their involvement on papers for which they are listed as corresponding author. For these papers to count as TIER I they must play a substantial role. An example would include working with a graduate student to design, implement, write and

play the primary role in seeing the paper through publication.

** The RTP candidate will provide the impact factor score and JRC rankings for journals in which papers are published. This will allow committee members to evaluate the impact of the work within the context of the candidate's academic field.

Candidates should inquire with RTP committee members about the appropriateness of other forms of scholarship not listed here.

It is expected that candidates will submit explicit documentation of their plans, proposals, and progress in their self-assessments. The candidate's RTP committee will evaluate these documents to determine how and whether they meet the criteria. It is expected that upon receiving critical feedback, candidates will show in subsequent RTP evaluation cycles that they have undertaken actions to remedy any shortfall.

A. Scholarship expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- i. Scholarly products (i.e., published article/book, funded grant) that were in progress or review before hire but completed during the probationary period will be accepted as evidence of achievements for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
- ii. At least one item from Tier I, an additional item from either Tier I or II, and at least two products from Tiers I through III. (Total of 4 items minimum).
- iii. CIGA Director: Two products from Tier I; an additional product from Tiers I or II; and at least two more products from Tier III including supervision of students engaged in the candidate's research. (Total of 5 items minimum)

B. Scholarship expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

- i. All scholarly products completed (i.e., published article/book, funded grant) after the last tenure/promotion review will be considered as evidence of achievements for promotion to full professor.
- ii. Three additional items, with at least one Tier I item. (Total of 3 additional items minimum)
- iii. CIGA Director: Two products from Tier I or II; an additional two products from Tiers I, II or III, including supervision of students engaged in the candidate's research. (Total of 4 additional items minimum)

Service

Service to the University

The evaluation criteria of the University-wide RTP policy will be followed for both tenure and promotion. New and continuing faculty members are expected to engage in department duties, including advising, standing and ad hoc committees, stewardship of major concentrations,

management of specialized teaching facilities, club organization, transfer orientations and maintaining the departmental webpage. In addition, GEP endorses activities undertaken by its faculty that can be used to meet multiple RTP criteria; e.g., an activity might meet criteria for both scholarship and service to the university. For example, a faculty member may involve students in her or his research data collection as part of a class project where the results or product of the class project enhance the University image. For promotion to full professor, faculty members are expected to fulfill service leadership roles either to their department (i.e., Chair) and/or in university-wide faculty governance.

Public Service and Service to the Community

The evaluation criteria of the University-wide RTP policy will be followed for both tenure and promotion. In addition, GEP endorses activities undertaken by its faculty that can be used to meet multiple RTP criteria; e.g., an activity might meet criteria for both scholarship and service to the community such as when we provide interviews to the popular press or give talks at service clubs that also reflect our scholarship or professional expertise. Community service is credited when a faculty member serves as, for example, an expert advisor for local organizations. Public service may be national or international in scope as well; it is not limited to local/regional interactions.

A. Service expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- i. Except for first probationary year, service on at least one department committee/initiative each year and on at least one University or School committee prior to applying for promotion or tenure. Serving as chair of a committee or in a leadership capacity carries more weight;
- ii. Effective advising in the major;
- iii. Involvement in at least one University-wide outreach activity;
- iv. Involvement with at least one organization outside of the university. Could be at local, regional, national, or international scale; and
- v. Professional service in candidate's field (e.g., serving on editorial board for journal in candidate's field, and serving as reviewer for scholarly journals and research grant panels).

B. Service expectations for Promotion to Full Professor

- i. Continued service on committees at the Departmental, School or University levels, and a record of initiative and assumption of leadership as a committee member;
- ii. Continued engagement with outside organizations;
- iii. Continued service to the profession; and
- iv. Continued effective advising in the major.