

DEPARTMENT OF EARTH & PLANETARY SCIENCES DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS

v.19, approved by the faculty 8/21/2023

The Bylaws of the Department of Earth & Planetary Sciences (EPS) at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) contained in this document are supplemented with additional procedures and regulations given in the following documents:

- 1) UTK Faculty Handbook <https://facultyhandbook.utk.edu/>
- 2) UTK Faculty Evaluation Manual <https://provost.utk.edu/faculty-evaluation-manual/>
- 3) EPS Graduate Student Manual https://eps.utk.edu/docs/EPS_Grad_Manual.pdf
- 4) EPS Student Success Fund Summary of Policy and Procedures
<https://eps.utk.edu/docs/DFPolicy.pdf>
- 5) EPS Advisory Board Charter <https://eps.utk.edu/docs/Alumni%20Charter.pdf>
- 6) Postdoctoral Program and Policies http://researchcouncil.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/47/2015/11/POSTDOCTORAL_PROGRAM_AND_POLICIE_S.pdf

In the case of any discrepancies between EPS Bylaws, and the contents of the above listed documents, the Bylaws have precedence over all Department documents, while College and University documents have precedence over the Bylaws.

1. Formulation of (and Changes to) Bylaws and Other Procedures

Bylaws (and other programmatic issues) can be instituted, amended, or modified by a majority vote of more than 50% of the tenure-track faculty members in the Department. The vote must occur at a Departmental faculty meeting.

Any tenure-track faculty member can ask that a vote be delayed until the next faculty meeting, if sufficient advance notice of a particular topic was not given (known informally as the “Otto rule”).

2. Departmental Governance and Responsibilities

2.1 Head and Associate Head

The Head is appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on recommendation by a search committee, in accordance with the procedures of the College. The Head provides leadership and represents the Department at College, University, and public functions. The Head has overall financial responsibility for the Department’s accounts. The Head is responsible for recruiting faculty and staff, and

handles all personnel matters in consultation with the faculty, staff and students as appropriate. The Head makes recommendations to the Dean concerning merit raises, and provides an explanation of the basis for raises to the faculty. The Head oversees the operation of the Department Office. The Head is also responsible for authorizing all proposals for external funding submitted through the department.

The Associate Head has budget signature authority and assists the Head as needed. Typical duties include space assignments, budgetary planning, responding to College requests for information, and preparing proposals for faculty positions and teaching funds etc. When the Department Head is absent, the Associate Department Head assumes the responsibilities of the Head, but operates within a previously agreed framework established by the Head in consultation with the Associate Head.

2.2 Coordinators and Committees

In most matters, the Department strives to operate in a democratic fashion through delegated service assignments. The Department Head appoints coordinators and committees, including naming committee chairpersons/directors, although faculty members may volunteer for specific service assignments. Coordinators are responsible for ensuring specific tasks / activities are covered, such as laboratory safety, course scheduling, seminar scheduling, newsletters, curriculum changes, and the maintenance of microscopes and rock preparation facilities.

Committees are responsible for defining their own operating procedures, except where specifically defined by Department Bylaws or by the documents listed above. Except for routine matters or tasks specifically allocated to committees by the faculty that do not require feedback, committees normally report, and make recommendations, to the full faculty. Final decisions in all academic matters rest with the faculty. All faculty members are welcome to attend the meetings of departmental committees except for the cases identified below. Only committee members have voting privileges during passage of committee decisions and resolutions, which are normally conducted in closed session.

There are two basic types of committee: ad hoc committees and standing committees. Ad hoc committees are temporary and are constituted to address a specific one-time issue that has arisen, such as a faculty search, bylaws revisions, or a program review. Standing committees continue from year to year, although their members change over time. The Department has six standing committees.

Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC) (co-chaired by the Directors of Undergraduates for the Geology, DUG, and Environmental Studies, DUES, programs). This committee has jurisdiction over undergraduate majors and the undergraduate academic program. The responsibilities of the UPC include consideration and recommendations to the faculty about changes in undergraduate course requirements and curriculum. The committee is also responsible for advising undergraduate majors and minors in the Department, for updating and maintaining departmental entries in the Undergraduate Catalog of the University, and for developing appropriate evaluation strategies, keeping applicable records, and meeting reporting requirements for Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) accreditation, commonly referred to as SACS (<https://sacs.utk.edu/>). A member of the UPC will serve

as the undergraduate student SACS coordinator, and will be responsible for performing these duties. Committee membership is normally the DUG, the DUES and three or four other faculty members.

Graduate Admissions and Program Committee (GAPC) (co-chaired by the Director of Graduate Studies, DGS, and the Graduate Admissions Chairperson, GAC) has jurisdiction over graduate admissions, graduate students, and the graduate academic program, except where University rules give individual dissertation committees such control. The GAC is responsible for facilitating a functional recruitment and admissions process. This includes handling the processing of inquiries and applications to the graduate program and communicating with applicants. The GAC also writes acceptance letters (co-signed by the Department Head) and manages the pool of funds for financial aid offers to new and continuing students. The DGS is responsible for monitoring the academic progress of all graduate students, including maintenance of a sufficient Grade Point Average (GPA), timely approval of thesis topics and committees, and successful completion of thesis and dissertation proposals. The DGS also has responsibility for updating and maintaining the Graduate Student Manual, Graduate Student Evaluation Forms, and departmental entries in the Graduate Catalog of the University.

The GAPC makes recommendations to the faculty on which applicants should be admitted to the graduate program and offered financial aid. The Committee also handles requests for change of status (e.g. M.S. to Ph.D.) and extension of financial aid from current graduate students. Final decision(s) about admission and/or financial aid are always decided by the full faculty, unless time constraints require a faster response. In that case, GAPC can seek prior permission of the faculty, to make final decisions. It is the responsibility of the GAPC to: (a) maintain communications with graduate students and consider requests for waivers; (b) decide whether individual thesis and dissertation committees are appropriate for the proposed project (the tenure-track faculty of the Department have final say in this matter in the case of disagreements); (c) consider and recommend to the faculty changes in department-wide course requirements and curriculum for graduate degrees; and (d) develop appropriate evaluation strategies and keep appropriate records in order to meet SACS reporting requirements. A member of GAPC will serve as the graduate student SACS coordinator, and will be responsible for performing these duties. Committee membership normally consists of the DGS, the GAC, the SACS Coordinator, and two or three other faculty members.

Student Success Committee (SSC) approves expenditures as outlined in the Student Success Fund Summary of Policy and Procedures online document (<https://eps.utk.edu/docs/DFPolicy.pdf>). The committee may also be asked to consider and make recommendations to the faculty about changes in the procedures for awards. The Department Head may also use development funds, as necessary, to enable the Department to achieve its mission more successfully. When discussing a request involving a faculty member, that person is excused from committee deliberations. The Chairperson is responsible for circulating regular announcements (at least once per semester) to undergraduate and graduate students requesting proposals for funding requests. The Chairperson also has responsibility for providing a report to the Head of approved expenditures for each year. Membership of the Committee normally consists of a Chairperson and two other faculty members.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments Committee (NFAC) reviews applicants and makes recommendations to the faculty regarding non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) appointments. NTTF include: Adjunct Faculty, Lecturers/Post-doctoral Teaching Associates, Research Faculty, Visiting Faculty, 0% UT-ORNL Joint Faculty, and others as defined in the Faculty Handbook. The tenured and tenure-track faculty then vote on these appointments, at the appropriate rank, in accordance with departmental and college bylaws. The committee also reviews applications from NTTF to direct graduate students and/or serve on graduate student committees, and makes recommendations to be voted on by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. The committee is responsible for keeping up-to-date records of NTTF appointments and NTTF approved to direct graduate students and/or serve on graduate student committees. Membership of the committee normally consists of a Chairperson and two other tenured or tenure-track faculty members.

Faculty Evaluations and Awards Committee (FEAC) performs annual reviews and makes award nominations (especially for College, Chancellor and other non-departmental awards). This committee serves in advisory capacity to the Head, who should attend, but not participate in, their committee meetings, other than providing factual information when requested. The committee reviews the annual performance of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members based on materials submitted through UTK Elements (<https://elements.utk.edu/login.html>) and reports back to the Head. Faculty performance is evaluated with respect to the rubric presented in Appendix I. These guidelines were developed by FEAC based on the formal expectations of faculty performance outlined in Section 6. FEAC is also responsible for identifying and nominating faculty members for relevant departmental, college, university, professional society, national, and international awards. The committee is always composed of a Chairperson and two other faculty members, all of whom are full professors. Because of the confidential nature of the evaluations, these committee meetings are not open for other faculty members to attend.

Inclusion and Belonging Committee (IC) is dedicated to advancing the department's vision for a diverse, equitable, and inclusive working environment where all individuals feel welcomed, encouraged, and embraced regardless of differing ideas, abilities, backgrounds, and needs. Membership of the Committee normally consists of a tenure-track faculty Chairperson, two other tenure-track faculty members, a non-tenure track faculty member, a staff member, a graduate student, and an undergraduate student. Only the tenure track faculty members can make decisions related to departmental governance. The IC serves three main functions in the department:

- Providing programming and training opportunities to broaden awareness of inclusion, belonging, and diversity-related opportunities;
- Offering venues and reporting opportunities where inclusion, belonging, and diversity-related issues can be brought forward, discussed, and addressed;

- Tracking, and reporting annually to the department, various inclusion, belonging, and diversity-related metrics in accordance with EPS's Diversity Action Plan and Strategic Plan.

The IC is also responsible for maintaining the Inclusion page on the department's website (<https://eps.utk.edu/diversity/council.php>). Tenure-track faculty members on the committee will automatically receive comments posted on the page's anonymous reporting form. The Chairperson is responsible for cataloging, and when appropriate, acting upon these comments. In addition, members of the IC collaborate with the Undergraduate and Graduate Program Committees to encourage recruiting of a diverse student body, and work to build partnerships with other diversity-related organizations and opportunities across UT and in the broader community.

Executive Committee (EC) is comprised of the Head, the Associate Head, and the Chairs or Co-Chairs of the five other standing committees. This committee meets approximately monthly during the semester, usually one week before regular faculty meetings. Its role is to advise the Head on important matters of departmental operation and governance. It also helps plan the agenda for upcoming Faculty Meetings (see Section 10).

3. Advisory Board

The Department uses a variety of techniques to communicate with its former students. The most formal manifestation of these is the EPS Advisory Board (AB). The mission of the AB is to provide external perspective, advice, recommendations, resources and related assistance as requested by the Department. The AB provides opportunities for alumni and associated supporters to become better acquainted with the activities and accomplishments of the Department, and to use their combined professional experience, expertise, and resources to influence and promote the Department's ongoing success. The AB also encourages students to contact its members regarding career and resume advice, or other general mentoring.

The AB has a membership of at least 10, and up to 30 members, plus the Department Head (or designated representative). The membership term for Board members is three years. The AB has a Chairperson, who is selected by Board members, and who serves for a two-year term. The AB seeks to maintain broad representation in its membership in regards to employment backgrounds, and to ensure a mix of members representing varied graduation dates. Member selection criteria, organizational structure and procedural rules are outlined in the EPS Advisory Board Charter: <https://eps.utk.edu/docs/Alumni%20Charter.pdf>.

The AB normally meets twice per year, once in the Fall and once in the Spring, in order to update Departmental priorities and network with students. Faculty members are welcome to participate in Board meetings and on occasion will be specifically asked to do so by the Head and/or Board Chairperson.

4. Faculty Searches and Appointments

4.1 Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Searches and Appointments

When the Department determines that there is a need for a new tenured or tenure-track faculty member, and when permission has been obtained to advertise a new faculty position, the head will name a search committee. The committee is normally comprised of a Chairperson and two or three other faculty members. In an effort to minimize systemic biases that can influence judgement in the faculty hiring process, all committee members must have participated in any diversity training required by the University.

The search committee is responsible for advertising the position, soliciting applications, keeping a list of all those contacted, screening applicants, and inviting several (normally two to four) candidates to visit the department, give seminars, and be interviewed by students, staff, faculty, and appropriate members of the College and University administration. Finally, the tenured and tenure-track faculty members are asked to indicate their preference among the candidates. The Head, unless compelling reasons dictate otherwise, will recommend the person preferred by the faculty. The search committee must follow all of the guidelines that are proscribed by the Provost and shall adhere to policies determined by the Office of Equity and Diversity at the University.

Only tenured and tenure-track faculty members vote on hiring, retention, and promotion decisions concerning tenured and tenure-track faculty. NTTF (as defined in the Faculty Handbook) may participate in discussions on hiring tenure-track faculty, but not in discussions of retention or promotion decisions.

4.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Appointments

Appointments and promotions of NTTF, other than part-time Lecturers/Post-doctoral Teaching Associates and Visiting Professors, are reviewed by NFAC and voted on by the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Part-time Lecturer/Post-doctoral Teaching Associates appointments are made by the Head in consultation with relevant course instructors. Specific appointment and promotion procedures for Lecturer/Post-doctoral Teaching Associates are described in Section 9 of the Department Bylaws. Visiting Faculty appointments and promotions are reviewed by the NFAC, but do not require a vote of the full faculty. The criteria for appointment to a particular rank for NTTF are described in the Faculty Handbook.

Appointments of NTTF are of variable duration up to 5 years, with the exact term specified in the appointment letter. Adjunct Faculty appointments are for a term of 3 years. All appointments can be renewed for a new term through the appointment processes described above. Renewal decisions include consideration of both performance and available funding as described in the Faculty Handbook.

4.3 Exempt Professional Staff Appointments

Appointments, promotions, and reclassifications of certain exempt professional staff, such as Postdoctoral Research Associates and Managers, are made by the Head

in consultation with relevant supervisors. Additional guidelines for the appointment and renewal of Postdoctoral Research Associates are given in the Postdoctoral Program and Policies document.

5. Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

5.1 Procedures

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor follow the procedures outlined in the UTK Faculty Handbook and the UTK Manual for Faculty Evaluation, links to both of which can be found at the beginning of this document. Department-specific criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion of Tenure Track Faculty by rank are provided in Appendix II of this document. Each faculty member needs be aware of these documents and attend appropriate workshops about the promotion process offered by the College and Provost. During all promotion decisions within the Department, one faculty member is appointed to summarize, in writing, the faculty discussions and votes. The Department Head prepares an independent assessment. The Department Head, with considerable assistance from the candidate, is responsible for assembling the tenure or promotion file and submitting it to the College. Assistant and Associate Professors are mentored by faculty mentoring committees (discussed in section 6.4). These committees advocate for their mentee and provide clear guidance on the mentee's progress in research, teaching, service duties, and growth as a departmental citizen.

The timeline and milestones for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are specified by University and College regulations. Each tenure-track faculty member with a probationary period of four or more years shall undergo an enhanced retention review in the academic year following the midpoint in his or her probationary period, typically the faculty member's fourth year of employment. A candidate for promotion is invited to propose external reviewers for dossier assessment, but no more than half of the final list of reviewers can be selected from the candidate's list, with the remainder selected by faculty of appropriate rank. Only tenured faculty members participate in discussions and voting for retention of probationary faculty and for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Consideration for promotion to Full Professor from Associate Professor normally occurs once the candidate has served at least five years at rank. In an individual's third or fourth year at the rank of Associate Professor, they will undergo an evaluation by the Department Head and Full Professors to determine their progress toward promotion. The candidate will submit to the Department Head a full curriculum vitae and preliminary dossier that follows the form of a promotion dossier, but which may have some elements missing. The Department Head will coordinate and establish exact requirements with the individual. After this dossier is reviewed by the Full Professors, the individual will receive a written evaluation of progress towards promotion and will discuss with the Department Head about how to meet expectations for being considered for promotion. In the candidate's fourth Annual Evaluation at rank,

and then fifth if necessary, the candidate will establish with affirmation by the Department Head when to proceed with submitting a dossier for promotion based on meeting achievements set during the third-year dossier evaluation. A candidate for promotion is invited to propose external reviewers for dossier assessment, but no more than half of the final list of reviewers can be selected from the candidate's list, with the remainder selected by faculty of appropriate rank. The timeline and milestones for submission and evaluation of the dossier are specified by University and College regulations. Only full Professors participate in discussions and voting for promotion to Professor. If an Associate Professor does not move forward for promotion in this time frame for any reason, then they should meet with the Full Professors every subsequent three-to-four years to reassess progress and establish new expectations for possible promotion.

Faculty may apply for early consideration for tenure, may have their probationary period extended, or may petition for a temporary suspension of their probationary period, as described in the Evaluation Manual and Faculty Handbook. Early consideration for promotion to either Associate or Full Professor requires approval by the Department Head, the Dean and the chief academic officer of the university, prior to submission of the candidate's dossier. The candidate makes the request for early promotion in the Spring term preceding the academic year in which they wish to be considered for promotion. Under extenuating circumstances, such as the need to relocate a laboratory to a different building or certain family care-giving responsibilities, an untenured Assistant Professor can request an extension / suspension of their probationary period for up to 2 years.

5.2 Criteria

Criteria for promotion and for tenure involve meeting at least the requirements for "meets expectations" as described in section 6 and the criteria provided in Appendix II. The faculty also take into account the external reviews in making their recommendations. Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor have different criteria: candidates for Full Professor are expected to have attained more prominent, even international, reputations as researchers, greater effectiveness as teachers and mentors, and more active roles in University and professional service and outreach than candidates for Associate Professor. Criteria for retention of probationary faculty are essentially the same as for promotion to Associate Professor, with allowances made for the time required to set up the necessary research facilities, to obtain external funding and attract graduate students, and to establish their research program. Allowances can also be made for the improvement of teaching skills and philosophy and course designs as their experience grows.

6. Expectations for Annual Evaluations of Tenure-Track Faculty Performance

Annual evaluations of faculty performance are conducted by the Head in consultation with the FEAC. Each faculty member prepares and submits a faculty

activity report and a planning statement for the upcoming year, using procedures specified by the College and University. Faculty are evaluated based the submitted materials, therefore, each faculty member is expected to comprehensively document their activities within the faculty reporting system. The FEAC reviews this report and planning statement and other relevant materials, such as student and peer teaching evaluations, before providing a recommendation (based on the rubric in Appendix I) to the Head. The Head then meets with the faculty member in person to discuss this report before submitting a final evaluation. The Head retains the right to make adjustments to the FEAC recommendations.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts should be documented and will be evaluated in the domain of teaching, research, or service as is appropriate for that effort. For example, participation on a DEI-related committee for the university or a professional society would be included within service, whereas a data-driven publication on diversity in a discipline would be included within research.

In accord with *The Faculty Handbook* 3.8.1., which requires faculty members to “review accomplishments as compared to previously set specific objectives for the faculty member” and “establish new objectives for the coming year” during the annual review, faculty members will submit a one-page planning statement to list objectives for the upcoming year and reflect on progress achieved in the past year. Reflection on the past year’s objectives should be no more than a brief paragraph and may explain the pursuance of new opportunities as they arise as progress in place of the previously stated objectives. Regularly scheduled, recurring efforts (such as the current year’s teaching assignment) need not be listed unless there is something unusual about these efforts.

Faculty members are evaluated as greatly exceeds expectations, exceeds expectations, meets expectations (i.e., performing at rank), below expectations, and far below expectations, as specified in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty performance in teaching, research, and service and outreach are evaluated with the following expectations:

6.1 Teaching

All tenured or tenure-track faculty must teach every semester unless they are on a formally-negotiated zero-teaching semester, course buyout, faculty development leave, faculty modified duties assignment, or leave of absence. The normal course load is two to three courses per year, with the expectation of a 3-year average of approximately 2.5 courses per year; faculty may also negotiate a lower teaching load with the Head as compensation for a heavy service load or multiple externally-funded research activities. Course load calculations are outlined in Appendix III.

Faculty members are generally expected to teach at the introductory, undergraduate major, and graduate levels, unless otherwise negotiated in advance with the Department. Course content is expected to be current and appropriate for the course level. Grading and evaluation techniques must be appropriate for the students’ knowledge and skill levels. Teaching methods are expected to be effective. Faculty

members are expected to treat students with respect and to serve as models of professionalism. Classroom teaching is assessed by the Head through student evaluations of each course and peer evaluations (see below).

Faculty members are evaluated for their mentorship of both undergraduate and graduate students in an active research program. Student mentorship forms a critical component of the Department's teaching enterprise. Assistant Professors are expected to have graduated at least one Master's degree student and have an active research program with M.S. and Ph.D. students by the time they are formally considered for promotion. Associate Professors are expected to have graduated multiple Master's degree students and at least one Ph.D. student before being formally considered for promotion. All faculty are expected to deliver supervision that ensures quality research (as evidenced by student research papers, conference talks, and poster presentations), appropriate inputs to student thesis/dissertation advising committees, and facilitating the completion of degrees in a timely fashion following guidelines set forth in the Graduate Handbook.

Exceptional performance as determined by the Department Head may be indicated by recognition of exceptional teaching quality by peer reviews, awards, or other means, by development of new courses, by development of innovative pedagogy, or by participation in programs for improvement of pedagogy or the effective implementation of pedagogical strategies beyond the normal expectations associated with an evolving teaching program. Exceptional success in student research mentoring can also be recognized as contributing to exceptional teaching performance including placement of graduates in competitive positions (research, academia, industry, etc.) Unsatisfactory performance may be indicated by content that is out of date, by disrespect of students, or by ineffective teaching methods as determined through peer and student teaching evaluations. Inadequate student-research mentoring can also contribute towards unsatisfactory teaching performance. Teaching performance is evaluated periodically by peer committees, as described in Appendix IV. At the Assistant Professor level, peer evaluations will occur at least twice before being formally considered for promotion; at the Associate Professor level, at least one peer evaluation will occur before being formally considered for promotion.

6.2 Research

Faculty members are expected to participate in research activities, resulting in at least two publications per year in professional journals or other reviewed outlets, averaged over a three-year review period including faculty or student-led publications. The Department also encourages the publication in high impact venues... It is recognized that data acquisition and times to publication in Earth and Planetary Sciences sub-disciplines may vary considerably. Faculty members are expected to engage in their research communities by sharing current research at professional scientific conferences through presentations or posters led by themselves or their lab members. Each faculty member should either have ongoing external grant funding to support their research or be actively seeking funding by submitting at least one proposal per year to a competitive funding program. At least one successful externally funded multi-year proposal or contract is expected when being formally considered for each

promotion step, and full professors are expected to have at least one externally funded multi-year grant or contract in effect within the past 6 years. When possible through the granting agency, proposals should seek funding to support Graduate Research Assistants, post-doctoral fellowships, and technical support personnel. Principal Investigators of grants are expected to manage their funding in a professional manner.

The faculty member's research program should have long-term goals and garner recognition in the scientific community such that Assistant Professors should show an emerging national reputation and Associate Professors should be recognized nationally or internationally by the time of promotion. Importance of an individual's research profile is recognized by, but not limited to: total numbers of citations, h-index, other publication impact factors, invited presentations at national and international conferences, keynote addresses, and high-visibility University presentations. Faculty are encouraged to maintain a public profile through Google Scholar or similar website to provide easy, wide-spread access to these research metrics.

Exceptional performance may be indicated by multiple first- or student-authored publications, publication in high impact venues, recognition from scientific organizations in the form of awards or fellowships or by management of a large and productive group of graduate students and/or postdocs, and continuous funding by competitive grants. Unsatisfactory performance results from failure to maintain an active research program, to publish results of the research, or to seek outside funding for research.

6.3 Service and Outreach

Faculty members are expected to participate fully in the governance and life of the department, including performing assigned committee functions and making informed decisions about faculty appointments, promotion, and tenure. Attendance is expected at faculty meetings, department seminars, and departmental social events whenever possible and not on approved leave. Being considered a "good faculty citizen" requires the willing and cheerful participation in a wide variety of aspects of the Departmental enterprise.

Faculty members are expected to engage in outreach and service activities where such opportunities exist. Outreach activities may include K-12 or museum programs to enrich and improve science education, presentations to community groups, or providing information to media to improve awareness of STEM fields. Faculty members are expected to serve the scientific community through a combination of reviews of manuscripts for scientific journals and proposals to funding agencies, and service on councils, advisory committees, editorial boards, or funding panels. Service to the College and University is encouraged, as opportunities arise. Assistant Professors typically receive a lower Departmental and College service load, leading minor committees and participating as members of major committees, such as GAPC. Associate and Full Professors are expected to assume leadership roles in Departmental governance by chairing and successfully executing the duties of major committees, as well as having expanded service within College- and University-level committees.

Exceptional service and outreach involves assuming departmental responsibilities well beyond the norm, or outreach that significantly raises the profile of the individual and the Department among the public, the scientific community, and/or the University at large. Unsatisfactory service and outreach is defined by failure to participate or execute assigned department service activities, failure to participate in outreach activities, or engagement in unprofessional behavior.

6.4 Faculty Mentoring

Faculty mentoring plays an important role in the development of junior colleagues, including post-doctoral fellows and Assistant/Associate Professors. Mentors are usually at a higher rank to the mentee. Assistant Professors are mentored by a committee of three tenured faculty, while Associate Professors are mentored by a committee of three Professors. These committees are established by the Head in consultation with the mentees and potential mentors. The mentoring process represents a formal, mutually beneficial, professional relationship with performance expectations for both mentors and mentees. Consequently, such assignments need to be agreeable to both parties in order to better facilitate successful outcomes. The relationship, particularly from the mentors' side, and its efficacy are evaluated annually by the Department Head. Mentees are required to meet at least twice per year with members of their mentoring committees to discuss their progress and plans for future development.

Mentoring committees can provide feedback to mentees aimed at indicating whether a junior colleague is "on track for promotion." However, there are many factors linked to the promotion process beyond what a mentoring committee can fully address. Rather the principal role of a mentoring committee is to transmit information gained through experience and provide support relevant to the professional development and growth of the mentee. Mentors act as teachers, counselors, interveners, and advocates so that mentees can develop skill sets necessary for successfully navigating professional matters, both within and beyond the University.

7. Evaluation of Department Head's and Associate Head's Performance

The Head is evaluated annually by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Departmental faculty members and staff provide anonymous feedback on the Head's performance to the Dean. The Dean then meets with the Head to discuss job performance based on a review of this feedback.

The Associate Head's performance is reviewed and evaluated by the Head at the time of the Associate Head's regular in person annual evaluation meeting.

8. Non-Tenure Track Faculty and Certain Exempt Professional Staff

Non-tenure track faculty include Adjunct Faculty, Lecturers/Post-doctoral Teaching Associates, Research Faculty, Visiting Faculty, 0% UT-ORNL Joint Faculty, and others as defined in the Faculty Handbook. Exempt professional staff include Postdoctoral Research Associates and Managers. NTTF and exempt professional staff,

except for Adjunct Faculty and Visiting Faculty, are required to have an annual evaluation meeting with the Head.

With the approval of the Department Head, NTTF are eligible to participate in and submit grant proposals. With the approval of the Department Head and their supervisor, exempt professional staff (e.g., Postdoctoral Research Associates and Managers) are also eligible to participate in and submit grant proposals.

All NTTF, except Visiting Faculty, may apply to serve on graduate student committees. All NTTF, except Adjunct Faculty and Visiting Faculty, may apply to direct graduate students. Applications from NTTF to serve on graduate student committees and direct graduate students will be voted on by the tenured and tenure-track faculty, after review and recommendation by the NFAC. Final approval requires the endorsement of the Head and the Dean of the Graduate School. A NTTF member who is approved to direct a graduate student is not eligible to request a departmental Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) fee waiver and stipend to support that student, unless there is a tenured or tenure-track co-chair to make such a request on their behalf, or there are unfilled GTA positions available.

Exempt professional staff, such as Postdoctoral Research Associates and Managers, are not eligible to direct graduate students or serve on student committees. However, they can be nominated by a tenured or tenure-track faculty member for a NTTF appointment other than Adjunct, such as Research Faculty, that would make them eligible to direct graduate students and/or serve on graduate committees. The nomination will be reviewed by NFAC, and voted on by the faculty.

9. Lecturer Appointment and Promotion Procedures

Unless otherwise noted, the appointment and promotion of non-tenure track lecturers in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences will follow the general guidelines outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The department head will initiate the promotion process in consultation with the candidate and other departmental faculty members, where appropriate. A departmental vote based on review of the candidate's dossier will be undertaken, and reported to the College. All tenured faculty members, and any non-tenure track lecturers at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks to be promoted to, are eligible to vote. The specific criteria for lecturer appointments and promotions are as follows:

1. Lecturer
 - a. The primary criterion to be considered for appointment at this rank is excellent instruction as evidenced by student evaluations, supervisor reviews, peer reviews, and annual departmental evaluations
 - b. Other examples of evidence used to determine excellent instruction may include:
 - Participation in department committees related to programs of instruction
 - Participation in workshops related to programs of instruction,
 - Well-developed instructional materials

- Ability to effectively teach a variety of courses
- Current information and materials provided in the classroom and laboratory
- Adherence to the policies and procedures outlined the University of Tennessee Teaching Guide (<https://teaching.utk.edu/ut-teachingguide/>)

2. Senior Lecturer

- a. The main criterion for promotion to Senior Lecturer rank is demonstration of distinction in teaching of undergraduate courses as evidenced by student evaluations, supervisor evaluations, peer evaluations, and annual departmental evaluations
- b. Examples of evidence used to determine distinction may include:
 - Professional development
 - Exemplary development of new courses, instructional materials, and syllabi, and new/revised curricular development
 - Advising and/ or mentoring
 - Awards or other recognition for teaching
 - Administration or service
 - Scholarly or creative work in the scholarship of teaching
 - Incorporating collaborative and experiential learning experiences, the ability to facilitate student learning, course content and scope, rigor, test construction and depth of depth of knowledge expected on examinations, and scope and quality of learning and evaluation activities
- c. Typically, at least five years of previous service at lecturer rank

3. Distinguished Lecturer

- a. For promotion to Distinguished Lecturer rank, Senior Lecturers should have demonstrated:
 - ongoing distinction in teaching since their promotion to Senior Lecturer, and
 - outstanding achievement in two or more of the following areas: teaching of undergraduate courses as evidenced by student evaluations, supervisor evaluations, peer evaluations, and annual departmental evaluations
- b. Typically, at least three years of previous service at Senior Lecturer rank.

10. Emeriti Faculty

Upon the recommendation of the Head, and with the approval of the active tenure-track faculty, Professors with long and meritorious research, teaching, and/or service records at the time of retirement may be awarded the rank of emeritus. Their appointment also requires the approval of the Chancellor, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Chief Academic Officer. Depending upon the availability of office space, Emeriti faculty may be offered office space within the Department. With the approval of the Head, Emeriti faculty can teach and attend Faculty meetings, but they cannot vote on programmatic issues.

11. Faculty Meetings

Faculty meetings are normally held once or twice per month during the academic year, although the Department Head may schedule meetings more or less frequently as needs arise. The agenda will normally be published in advance.

All active faculty, including non-tenure track faculty, are expected to attend, except when excused for professional obligations. Only active tenure-track faculty with majority appointments in the Department can vote on programmatic issues. Emeriti professors, staff, and undergraduate and graduate student representatives are welcome to attend, but cannot vote.

Some discussions are restricted in who can participate. For example, staff and students will be asked to leave when any personnel matters are discussed. For the retention and promotion of Lecturers, Assistant Professors, and Associate Professors, all faculty at or below the level being considered will be asked to leave.

APPENDIX I: Summary of Rubric used in Tenure-Track Faculty Annual Evaluations

*Note: Faculty are expected to meet all criteria within “Meets Expectations” column per the by-laws text. Criteria listed under “Exceeds Expectations” are examples of how faculty may achieve that rank; faculty need not meet the full set of examples to earn exceeds expectations rank. “Greatly Exceeds Expectations” is earned rarely and only when a faculty member demonstrates proficiency well beyond that of “Exceeds Expectations”. Ratings of “Far Below Expectations” are similarly rare and only given when a faculty member falls well short of the criteria listed under “Below Expectations.” The final score in a category (teaching, research, service) or overall is based on a holistic evaluation and need not be a simple average of the component ranks.

TEACHING						
Evaluation Topic	Far Below Expectations	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Greatly Exceeds Expectations	Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	
Quantitative course load, development, and pedagogical training		Average of less than 2 courses per academic year	2.5 courses per academic year averaged over three years, with participation in courses generally at introductory, undergraduate major, & graduate levels	Development of new courses Teaching above expected number of courses Participation in programs for improvement of pedagogy beyond normal expectations associated with an evolving teaching program		Faculty may negotiate with the Head for reduced course load to accommodate increased workload and expectations in service or research
Quality of classroom teaching		Content is out of date and/or teaching methods are ineffective based on peer and student teaching evaluations	Content and pedagogy provide an effective learning environment as determined by student and peer evaluations Grading & evaluation techniques are appropriate for students' knowledge & skill levels	Development of innovative pedagogy Exceptional teaching quality determined by peer reviews, awards, or other means		
Mentorship & supervision of both undergraduate & graduate students		Failure to recruit students for directed research Inadequate student research mentoring resulting in no research output or consistent lack of timely graduation	Mentors graduate and undergraduate students in directed research Graduate advisees finish their degree programs in a timely fashion Serves as an effective research mentor for advisees as demonstrated by presentations at conferences, grant submissions, or papers submitted/published Serves as a non-chair member of graduate student advising committees within and outside the department	Exceptional success of advisees in terms of number graduated, papers published, conference talks and poster presentations, grants awarded, post-graduation placement, etc. Exceptional level of non-chair participation in student advising committees (both within the department and external)		Expectations for <i>promotion</i> by starting rank: Assistant Professors to graduate at least 1 M.S. degree student & program with M.S. and Ph.D. students before promotion; Associate Professors to graduate multiple M.S. & at least 1 Ph.D. student before promotion
			Treats students with respect; serve as models of professionalism			Respectful mentoring is a Head-only evaluation criterion

RESEARCH / CREATIVE ACTIVITY						
Evaluation Topic	Far Below Expectations	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Greatly Exceeds Expectations	Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	
Quantity of Research Output		Failure to publish results of research	At least 2 publications/year in professional journals or other reviewed outlets, averaged over a three-year period, at least some of which are first-authored or student-authored Presentation of research by faculty or lab members at scientific conferences	Number of publications higher than typical for discipline over the three-year period or an average of 3.5 papers/year or higher in any discipline A large number of first- and student-authored publications		Data acquisition & times to publication in Earth & Planetary Sciences sub-disciplines may vary considerably, which is recognized
Quality of Research Output		Failure to publish results of research	Publications primarily in main-stream journals or volumes	Publication in very high impact journals or volumes		
External Funding		Failure to seek outside funding for research	Ongoing external funding or submission of at least one grant proposal per year to a competitive funding program Including support for Graduate Research Assistants and/or post-doctoral fellowships and technical support personnel in proposals where possible	Multiple ongoing grants and/or submission of multiple grant proposals per year Managing a large, productive group of graduate students and/or postdocs continuously funded by competitive grants		At least one successful externally funded multi-year proposal or contract is expected when being considered for each promotion
			Manage funding in a professional manner			Funds management is a Head-only Evaluation
Research program development		Failure to maintain an active research program Lack of progress on goals within annual planning statements	Maintain an active research program with long-term goals as evidenced in annual planning statements Garner recognition in scientific community appropriate for rank indicated by, but not limited to: total numbers of citations, h-index, other publication impact factors, invited presentations at national & international conferences, keynote addresses, and high-visibility University presentations	Recognition from scientific organizations in the form of awards or fellowships Exceptional recognition for rank indicated by, but not limited to: total numbers of citations, h-index, other publication impact factors, invited presentations at national & international conferences, keynote addresses, and high-visibility University presentations		Expectations by rank: Assistant Professors should show an emerging national reputation; Associate and Full Professors should be recognized nationally or internationally, respectively

SERVICE						
Evaluation Topic	Far Below Expectations	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Greatly Exceeds Expectations	Comments
	1	2	3	4	5	
Departmental Contributions: service load		Failure to participate in assigned department service activities	Participate fully in the governance and life of the department, including performing assigned committee functions, peer teaching reviews, & making informed decisions about faculty appointments & promotion & tenure	Assuming department responsibilities well beyond the norm for workload distribution		Expectations by rank: Assistant Professors typically receive lower Departmental service loads, manage smaller committees or participate as members of critical committees (GPC, admissions); Associate and Full Professors are expected to assume leadership roles in Departmental governance by chairing or successfully executing duties of critical committees as assigned by the Head
College and University Contributions		Lack of College or University service	Participation in College or University level committees according to rank expectations	College or University service that significantly raises the profile of the individual or the Department among the College or University at large		Expectations by rank: Assistant Professors are typically expected to have a lower College service load; Associate and Full Professors are expected to serve on College- or University-level committees
Disciplinary Contributions		Lack of disciplinary service	Demonstration of regular contributions to the discipline	Disciplinary contributions that significantly raise the profile of the individual and the Department among scientific community		Disciplinary contributions include reviews of manuscripts for scientific journals & proposals to funding agencies, governance of scientific societies, serving on councils, advisory committees, editorial boards, & funding panels
Outreach contributions		Lack of outreach activities	Demonstration of contributions to outreach efforts	Outreach contributions that significantly raise the profile of the individual and the Department among the public		Examples of outreach activities include K-12 programs to enrich and improve science education, presentations to community groups, or providing information to media to improve awareness of science in general
Departmental Contributions: Citizenship		Actions that are detrimental to the function and/or reputation of the department	Considered a "good faculty citizen" requires willingly and cheerfully participating in a wide variety of aspects of the Departmental enterprise	Leadership in developing a positive and inclusive departmental culture		Attendance is expected at faculty meetings, department seminars, and department events whenever possible Development of a positive, respectful, and inclusive culture is a Head only evaluation.

APPENDIX II: Metrics and Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty by Rank

The department expects that all members of its faculty contribute with respect to research, teaching, and service/outreach. A clear record of accomplishment and potential in these three areas is absolutely necessary for positive tenure and promotion decisions. To be considered for promotion and tenure, candidates must at least meet the department specific requirements for “meets expectations” as described in Section 6 of the Bylaws in annual reviews for each of the three areas of teaching, research and service/outreach. The following metrics of professional ability and accomplishment, and criteria by academic rank, are also considered in deliberations regarding annual retention review of tenure-track Assistant Professors, awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, promotion to the rank of Professor, and for annual and accumulative post-tenure reviews.

Metrics:

Teaching ability and effectiveness

- compilations of student evaluations
- reports from peer teaching review committees
- comments by colleagues who have first-hand knowledge of the faculty member’s teaching performance and/or communication skills
- written comments by students
- curriculum or pedagogical activities and accomplishments
- national and/or local teaching awards
- level of contribution to the teaching mission of the department

Research and Scholarly Activities

- level of external support (relative to peers in equivalent or similar scientific areas)
- significance of comments by professional peer reviewers
- external letters of evaluation by experts in candidate’s field of research
- national/international awards and recognition
- significance and number of publications in refereed journals, as well as contributions to scientific monographs and textbooks
- invited presentations at scientific meetings
- contributed presentations and involvement in contributed presentations
- invitation to organize symposia, prepare monographs, edit volumes, etc.
- local awards

Service / Outreach

- participation in departmental Faculty Meetings

- effective participation in departmental, College, and University committee and ad-hoc service activities; at least some of these should involve a leadership role (especially for tenured faculty)
- participation in professional outreach, including involvement with K-12 schools
- regional industry, and community organizations
- contributions to national, regional, and local agencies
- membership and participation in professional organizations
- participation in disciplinary meetings and symposia as organizer or chairperson
- reviewing and editorship efforts

Criteria by Academic Rank:

I. Retention

A non-tenured Assistant Professor should:

- hold a doctorate in an appropriate field
- have an active research program with the goal of establishing a strong record of accomplishment involving the factors listed above by the time of consideration for tenure and promotion
- demonstrate a strong commitment to teaching and clear promise of excellence in classroom performance
- participate significantly in professional activities in the discipline beyond formal teaching and research

II. Tenure and Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor (and Expectations of an Associate Professor undergoing Annual or Cumulative Review)

An Assistant Professor applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, or an Associate Professor undergoing annual or cumulative review, should:

- hold a doctorate in an appropriate field
- normally have served as an Assistant Professor for a minimum of five years
- have a strong internationally-recognized record of research and scholarly activity, as measured by the metrics listed above, with clear promise that promotion to Professor is likely at some point in the future
- successfully mentored M.S. and/or Ph.D. students
- show clear evidence of competent teaching
- have a reasonable and balanced record of contributions to meeting the service needs of the University, the discipline, and the community

III. Promotion to Rank of Professor (and Expectations of a Professor undergoing Annual or Cumulative Review)

An Associate Professor applying for promotion to the rank of Professor, or a Professor undergoing annual or cumulative review, should:

- hold a doctorate in an appropriate field
- normally have served as an Associate Professor for at least five years
- have acquired an international record of research and scholarly activity according to the factors listed above that is indicative of continuous and progressive professional development since appointment to the faculty of the University
- have successfully mentored Ph.D. students
- have achieved a demonstrated record as a conscientious and effective teacher in his/her field
- have contributed significantly and substantially in some combination to meeting the service responsibilities of the University, the discipline, and the community

APPENDIX III: Course Load Accounting

As described in Section 6.1 of the Bylaws, the normally-expected minimum teaching load for a full-time tenure track or tenured faculty member is 2.5 courses per year as averaged over a 3-year period. Certain stipulations apply in the way the Department “counts” these course loads; these are outlined below:

Courses that “count”:

- Graded courses earning at least 3 credit hours and taught by a single faculty member are included in the calculation as one course. This applies whether the course was offered through the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences or another department.
- Ad hoc “Special Problems” courses (e.g., GEOL 490/590) taught by a single faculty member count like any other course toward course load if they earn at least three credits.
- Other graded courses taught by a single faculty member but earning less than three credit hours (e.g., GEOL 596, 1 credit, FYS 129, 1 credit) count as a fraction of a course, with that fraction being determined as the number of credit hours divided by three.
- Courses (again, 3+ credits) that are taught by two or more faculty members count as a fraction of a course for each instructor, with that fraction being determined as the reciprocal of the number of instructors.

Courses that do not “count”:

- Independent study courses (e.g., GEOL 493/593) and serving as an instructor for Thesis/Dissertation work (GEOL 500/600) do not count in course load calculations, regardless of the number of credits offered.
- Managing attendance for the Klepser Colloquium Series (GEOL 595, 1 credit) does not count toward teaching load. This is considered a service assignment.

APPENDIX IV: Procedures for Department Teaching Reviews

The approach to review of teaching should be multi-faceted, including inputs from the faculty member being reviewed, peers, and students. Teaching assessment and evaluation should minimize burdens for faculty, administrators, and students. This

process applies to all faculty members, where the distinction between probationary and tenured faculty will be in the frequency of assessments.

Self Assessment

Self-assessment allows the faculty member to reflect on teaching, both for his or her benefit and to facilitate constructive dialogue about teaching with others. Self-assessments of teaching must be done prior to consideration for tenure and any promotion. A minimum output from this process would be a document about the person's teaching philosophy and may include, but not be limited to, self-assessment results from previous reviews, teaching goals, methods for achieving these goals, and plans for achieving teaching excellence. The document may be supported by a teaching portfolio that illustrates implementations or successes of the philosophy, documents activities such as short courses that improved teaching skills, considers strengths and areas for improvement, and possibly other aspects of teaching.

Peer Assessment

Peer assessment provides the faculty member with useful feedback from their peers which identifies strengths and areas for improvement in teaching. A peer teaching review should be conducted for a tenured faculty member approximately every five years. A probationary faculty member should receive a peer review every two years. Where special circumstances arise, a faculty member has the right to request reconvening of a peer review team or formation of a new peer review team in the interval between scheduled peer reviews.

The peer review team consists of three faculty members. At least two of these members, including the chair, are tenured. One member is selected by the faculty member under review, one by the Department Head, and the third is agreed upon between the two.

The peer review team should offer feedback that: (1) considers whether the courses of the faculty member have appropriate content and offer students sufficient opportunity to acquire appropriate skills; (2) considers whether the grading system and evaluation/assessment tools are consistent with course content and student skill development; and (3) examines the teaching methods of the faculty member for effectiveness. Feedback is facilitated by peer review team meetings with the faculty member to discuss teaching before, after and otherwise as needed or requested during the review process. Feedback will be based on (1) examination of materials (e.g. handouts, tests, web pages, etc.); and (2) observation in the classroom or instructional setting for at least one course being taught during the semester of the peer assessment. Each team member should visit at least three class meetings. At the end of the semester, the peer review team produces a written report that is discussed with the faculty member being reviewed, and presents strengths and areas for improvement for the teaching of the faculty member.

Student Reviews

Student questionnaires are to be administered each semester for each class with more than the minimum number of students as defined by the University. However, results from small classes should be used cautiously because of the variability in results introduced by small samples.

Summary Evaluation by Department Head

At the completion of a peer review, the Head prepares a written summary of teaching, taking into account the peer review, student reviews, and the self-assessment. This summary review becomes part of the permanent record.

Procedures for Dealing with “Below Expectations” or “Far Below Expectations”

If a faculty member receives a teaching summary evaluation rating of “below expectations” or “far below expectations”, he or she must present a corrective plan to the Department Head. The plan should be constructed to implement changes in content, evaluation techniques, and teaching methods as needed. At the next appropriate semester, the Department Head appoints a new peer review committee in consultation with the faculty member. The new team receives copies of the previous summary review and the plan of the faculty member to improve their teaching. The purpose of the new peer review team is to determine whether changes have been implemented and whether the changes raise the teaching of the faculty member to “meets expectations” (i.e., performing at rank).