

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN  
UNIVERSITY**

**DEPARTMENT OF  
GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY**

**FACULTY HANDBOOK**

Last Revised: August 8, 2005

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b>	3
<b>Section 1 The Department of Geology and Geography</b>	
1.1 Description of the Department and its Mission .....	6
1.2 History of the Department.....	7
1.3 Strategic Plan .....	12
1.4 Department Personnel and Organization .....	13
1.4.1 Department Chair.....	13
1.4.2 Administrative Secretary.....	13
1.4.3 Laboratory Directors.....	14
1.5 The Faculty .....	15
1.5.1 Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty.....	14
1.5.2 Emeritus Faculty .....	17
1.5.3 Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty.....	18
1.5.4 University Awards to Geology and Geography Faculty.....	19
1.6 Meetings of the Faculty.....	20
1.6.1 Regular Meetings of the Faculty.....	20
1.6.2 Participation and Voting in Faculty Meetings .....	20
1.6.3 Time and Location of Meetings.....	20
1.6.4 First Meeting of the Academic Year.....	20
1.6.5 Minutes of the Faculty Meetings .....	20
1.7 Committees and Responsibilities of the Faculty.....	21
1.7.1 Permanent Committees of the Department .....	21
1.7.2 Ad Hoc Committees of the Department.....	21
1.7.3 Other Departmental Activities .....	22
1.7.4 College of Science and Technology Committees .....	25
1.7.5 University Committees .....	26
1.8 Generalized Annual Academic Calendar.....	28
1.9 Department Annual Report.....	30
1.10 Publications of the Department.....	31
1.10.1 The Department Web Site.....	31
1.10.2 Department Brochure.....	31
1.10.3 GIS Program Brochure.....	31
1.10.4 Annual Newsletter.....	31
1.10.5 Faculty Handbook.....	31
1.10.6 Student Handbook.....	31
1.10.7 Environmental Geology and Earth Lab Manuals.....	31
1.11 Foundation Accounts .....	32
1.11.1 The Department of Geology and Geography Fund.....	32
1.11.2 The H. Stanley Hanson Geology Scholarship.....	32
1.11.3 The Daniel Good Geography Scholarship .....	32
1.11.4 The Richard M. Petkewich Service Award.....	32
1.12 Facilities.....	33
1.12.1 Facilities Overview .....	33
1.12.2 Access .....	33
1.12.3 Herty Building.....	33
1.12.4 Anderson Hall .....	34
1.12.5 Information Technology (GIS Laboratory).....	34

1.13 Equipment.....	35
1.13.1 Office and General Purpose Equipment.....	35
1.13.2 Computer Peripherals.....	35
1.13.3 Field Equipment.....	35
1.13.4 Laboratory Equipment.....	37

## Section 2 Faculty Employment

2.1 Personnel Policies and Guidelines.....	38
2.1.1 Overview of the Department's Personnel Process.....	38
2.1.2 The Hire.....	40
2.1.3 The Probationary Period.....	41
2.1.4 The Three Criteria.....	43
2.1.5 Teaching.....	46
2.1.6 Scholarship.....	50
2.1.7 Service.....	57
2.1.8 Departmental Guidelines for Faculty Dossiers.....	59
2.1.9 The Post-Tenure Period.....	62
2.1.10 Promotions.....	63
2.1.11 Personnel Committees.....	65
2.1.12 References.....	67
2.2 Personnel Procedures.....	68
2.2.1 General Statement.....	68
2.2.2 Criteria Used for Evaluation.....	70
2.2.3 Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching.....	72
2.2.4 Procedures for Annual Review of Faculty.....	73
2.2.5 Procedures for the Retention of Probationary Faculty.....	74
2.2.6 Procedures for Pre-Tenure Evaluations.....	75
2.2.7 Procedures for Tenure Evaluation.....	77
2.2.8 Procedures for Promotion Evaluations.....	79
2.2.9 Procedures for Post-Tenure Review.....	81
2.3 Guidelines for Departmental Travel Funding.....	83
2.3.1 Introduction.....	83
2.3.2 Extra-Departmental Sources of Travel Funds.....	83
2.3.3 Priorities for Department Funding of Professional Travel.....	84
2.3.4 International travel.....	85
2.4 Reporting Annual Leave and Sick Leave.....	86
2.4.1 Introduction.....	86
2.4.2 Departmental Process.....	86

## Section 3 Resources for Faculty

3.1 Department Inventory.....	87
3.1.1 Inventoried Property.....	87
3.1.2 Annual Asset Inventory.....	87
3.1.3 Maintaining the Inventory.....	87
3.1.4 Off Campus Use of Inventoried Property.....	88
3.1.5 Thefts, Damage, and Disposal of Inventoried Property.....	88
3.1.6 Discrepancies in Equipment Inventory.....	88
3.2 Information Resources.....	89
3.2.1 Library.....	
3.2.2 GeoRef.....	
3.3 The Spatial Analysis and Geographic Information Systems Laboratory (SAGIS).....	90

## **Appendices**

A1.1 Department of Geology and Geography Program Reviews

A1.2 Department of Geology and Geography Level III Strategic Plan

A1.3 The Ideal Department

A1.4 *Five Steps to Oblivion II* by Ron Abler

A1.5 *You Probably Think This Song Is About You* by Stanley Fish

A1.6 *Steps to Secure an Unsuccessful Personnel Search* by Susan L. Cutter

A2.1 Classroom Observation Rating Form

A2.2 COST Annual Faculty Review Form

A2.3 Academic Affairs Recommendation for Tenure Form

A2.4 Academic Affairs Recommendation for Promotion Form

A2.5 Post-Tenure Review Form

A2.6 Student Evaluation Form

A2.7 Describing Scholarly Activities and Research: The Motivating, Derivative, and Operational Research Questions

## PREFACE

This Handbook was prepared by and for the Faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography to compile and organize information related to the activities of the Department. In personnel actions (Section 2), the Handbook provides a disciplinary perspective on hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, guidance for faculty in preparing documents, and outlines the procedures used by the Department to make recommendations. The Handbook was adopted by the Faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography through consensus on April 3, 2003.

Academic governance, personnel policies, and procedures, are identified in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook and other governance documents. The Department policies that follow represent extensions of College of Science and Technology and University guidelines. In situations where there is an apparent discrepancy, the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology Governance Document, Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, and the Policy Manual of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents (<http://www.usg.edu/admin/policy/>) take precedence over Departmental policies.

This document should not be considered an official publication of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, nor should it be construed as the basis of a contract between a faculty member and the institution. In case of any divergence from or conflict with the Bylaws or Policies of the Board of Regents, the official Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Regents always prevail.

# SECTION 1

## THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY

### 1.1 - DESCRIPTION OF DEPARTMENT AND ITS MISSION

The Department of Geology and Geography contributes broadly to the education of Georgia Southern University students. The Department's course offerings support the Core Curriculum in Areas D1, D2, D3, and E. No other department in the University contributes to as many as four areas of the Core. The Department of Geology and Geography offers course work that leads to a Bachelor of Science degree with a Major in either Geology or Geography and a Bachelor of Arts degree with Major in Geology. The Department has a formal Minor in Geographic Information Systems. Geographic Information Science is one of the approved Second Disciplines in the College of Information Technology. The Department oversees two special purpose laboratories: the Earth Science Computer Applications Laboratory (ESCAL) and the Spatial Analysis and Geographic Information Systems (SAGIS) Laboratory. The Department works to lift south Georgia's educational attainment through the pre-service and in-service (graduate) teacher education programs at Georgia Southern. With the world as our subject, the Department provides field experiences in Georgia, across the United States, and in other countries (e.g., recently in Ecuador, Britain, and Ireland). In all these settings, quality teaching is the Department's highest priority.

The geography program provides opportunities in both human and physical geography. Faculty are actively involved in regional historical geography, cultural geography, regional economic development (GIS applications), environmental quality, and biogeographic and conservation issues. The program graduates students who are geographically literate, clear-thinking, articulate in oral and written presentation, and effective problem solvers.

Geology is by its very nature a broad, eclectic science with many applications to a range of fundamental scientific issues. As the most integrative of sciences, geology is also the scientific discipline most directly concerned with the major environmental issues of resources, hazards, and planning. The geology faculty has expertise in the core areas of mineralogy, petrology, stratigraphy, structural geology, paleontology, hydrology, and geomorphology. Georgia Southern's geology program emphasizes oral and written communication skills, research and problem solving ability, and teamwork, producing graduates who succeed in diverse and challenging work environments and in graduate programs.

The combined Department of Geology and Geography provides a broad spectrum of faculty expertise, curriculum choices, and learning opportunities for students. The Department functions as an integrated unit, sharing equipment, laboratory and classroom space, and common courses. Because the Department is closer to the coast than any similar unit in the University System, the geology and geography programs pursue a shared identity as the center for the study of Coastal Georgia, providing unique opportunities for teaching, learning, and research.

## **1.2 - HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT**

(Original version by Dr. Gale A. Bishop)

### **1.2.1 FOUNDING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY (1966-1979)**

The Department of Geology was founded in 1966 by petrologist Dr. H. Stanley Hanson who arrived at Georgia Southern in 1964 as a member of the Department of Chemistry. In 1966 two new faculty members, Dr. Bill Neal and Dr. Tom Bond, were hired to assist in service functions for freshman science requirements and to design a new major for Georgia Southern College. Dr. Wong, a clay mineralogist, joined the faculty in 1968 and left in 1969.

A major offering a B.A. or B.S. in Geology was instituted in 1968 and the first students graduated in 1970. That year, palynologist Dr. James H. Darrell joined the faculty, replacing Dr. Bond who moved to Idaho State at Pocatello, Idaho, as Associate Dean. In 1970, Dr. Harold McDonald replaced Dr. Wong and subsequently left Georgia Southern, taking a job at the University of Arkansas in 1971.

Dr. Richard M. Petkewich replaced McDonald and Dr. Gale A. Bishop joined the faculty, replacing Bill Neal, who accepted a position at Grand Valley State University, Michigan. By 1971, a stable faculty core for the Department had been established to service the heavy service teaching loads that averaged 15 contact hours per quarter at that time. The number of majors stabilized at about 20 to 25.

### **1.2.2 CREATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY (1980-1987)**

Dr. Daniel B. Good, who came to Georgia Southern as a member of the Department of History and Geography, moved to the Department of Geology during an institutional reorganization in 1980. With the addition of Dr. Good, the Department of Geology became the Department of Geology and Geography.

In 1979, the Georgia Southern College Mosasaur was collected in the southern Black Hills of South Dakota. Through the efforts of Dr. Bishop, the mosasaur fossil was donated to Georgia Southern University by the Museum of Geology at South Dakota School of Mines and Technology. This gift resulted in the formation of the Georgia Southern Museum in 1980, with Dr. Bishop as its first director.

In 1987, Dr. Hanson retired, opening the position of Department Head to a national search which succeeded in attracting Dr. Fredrick J. Rich, who assumed Department's administrative duties in 1988. Upon Dr. Hanson's retirement, the faculty established the H. Stanley Hanson Geology Scholarship. The first scholarship awards were made in 1994.

### **1.2.3 REGIONAL UNIVERSITY STATUS AND RAPID GROWTH (1987-1990)**

During 1981 football was reinstated as an intercollegiate sport at Georgia Southern. This event helped to trigger a period of explosive growth which was nurtured by efforts to recruit new students while maintaining academic excellence. Georgia Southern College grew from a predominantly undergraduate state college of about 5,000 students in 1985 to a diverse, comprehensive Regional University of 14,000 students in less than 10 years.

During these growth years, core curriculum requirements in science were partly served by the Department of Geology and Geography by hiring temporary instructors to handle the load. Temporary faculty included Sally Harris, Bill Morris, David Quattlebaum, JoAnne Shadrui, R. Kelly Vance, and Brian Meyer. David Ferrell, Grace Holder, Wade Holder and Paul Sacks served in the hard rock area.

During 1983, Dr. Richard Petkewich led a team to collect and document an archaeocyte whale from nuclear Plant Vogtle in Burke County, Georgia, a task accomplished with 11 days of field work. This specimen would eventually prove to be the oldest fossil whale in North America.

Dr. Wade Holder was hired as mineralogist and petrologist in 1985 and his wife, Grace Holder, was hired as a temporary instructor in 1986. Economic geologist, Dr. R. Kelly Vance, was appointed as a temporary Assistant Professor in 1986. Dr. Vance successfully competed for a permanent position in 1990; filling the vacant line created by Wade Holder's departure.

Dr. Sandy Mitcham, a cultural geographer, joined the faculty in 1990 and left Georgia Southern in 1993.

#### **1.2.4 DEPARTMENT GROWTH AND DIVERSIFICATION (1990-1995)**

Geologists Dr. Denise A. Battles and Dr. Mark A. Evans and cultural geographer Sandy Mitcham joined the department's tenure-track faculty in 1990. David Linsley and Richard Hulbert arrived that same year as temporary geology faculty. In 1993, Dr. Hulbert secured a tenure-track position within the department, allowing him to continue his work on Georgia Southern's Vogtle whale specimen as well as curatorial duties in the Museum. A college reorganization in 1994 resulted in the establishment of the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology, created when the science units were relocated from the College of Arts & Sciences and merged with the College of Technology. As part of reorganization, there was a comprehensive assessment of the proper placement of the geography program, and the Department re-affirmed its decision to be a combined unit. Also at this time, Dr. Battles took on an administrative role in the new college office, while retaining her faculty position.

Dr. Jonathon Lieb, and Dr. Mark R. Welford joined the faculty to increase offerings in geography as the Department built toward a major in geography. (The Bachelor of Science Degree with a Major in Geography was approved in 1997 by the Board of Regents.) This cadre of junior faculty members formed a strong Departmental coalition which was assimilated with changing assignments and key resignations.

Ms. Frances Troutman joined the Department in 1994 as its first full-time secretary, enhancing Department's programs in many ways. Ms. Troutman left in 1997 and was replaced by Ms. Sarita Warren.

Dr. Vernon J. Henry (Emeritus Professor of Geology at Georgia State University) joined the faculty on a part-time basis in 1994. Dr. Henry's work led to the creation of the Applied Coastal Research Laboratory (ACRL) on the campus of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography (SkIO). The ACRL became Georgia Southern's "foot hold" at SkIO and provided facilities for faculty and student research.

Dr. George Lynts, visiting Professor of Geology, taught service courses and initiated computer development activities in Earth Science Education while at Georgia Southern University.

#### **1.2.5 FACILITIES RENOVATED (1995-1998)**

In 1995 the Department of Family and Consumer Science moved into new facilities and the Department of Geology and Geography was able to expand into most of the first floor of the Herty Building. At this time (1995) a Model Technology Grant was received and Room 1113 was remodeled into the Distance Learning Laboratory and Room 1114 into the Earth Science Computer Applications Laboratory.

The implementation of these facilities allowed Dr. Good and Dr. Bishop to receive two of three Georgia Southern University grants in 1996 from the Board of Regents Office of Information and Instructional Technology for "Connecting Teachers to Technology," modeling the utility of facilities in grantsmanship. These renovations were further enhanced by

renovations to the Vertebrate Paleontology and Museum Preparation Area in 1996 which also upgraded the Palynology Laboratory to a competitive facility.

Mr. Craig Oyen and Mr. Derek Alderman joined the faculty in temporary capacities to assist in covering service commitments and to relieve the instructional pressure so the entire faculty could consider alternative roles in instruction, research, and service.

Dr. James Reichard, a hydrologist, joined the permanent faculty in 1996 and Ms. Victoria Berry joined the faculty in a one-year temporary geography position for academic year 1996-97.

In 1997, 1.4 million dollar project was funded by the NSF Academic Research Infrastructure Program, Georgia Southern, and the state to modernize geology and chemistry labs in the Herty Building for training students in scientific research. With Dr. Denise Battles as the PI, the Soft Rock, Hard Rock, and Rock Preparation Labs as well as some chemistry labs, were renovated.

In 1997, Dr. Pranoti M. Asher, an igneous petrologist and geochemist, joined the regular faculty as a full-time replacement for Dr. Battles, whose administrative appointment had become ongoing. At the same time, regional geographer, Dr. Samuel L. Couch became the third tenure-track geographer.

Dr. Rich announced his intention to step down from the chair at the end of the 1997-98 academic year and a nationwide search was initiated for a replacement. In March 1998, Dr. Dallas D. Rhodes, a geomorphologist, was appointed as the third chair of the Department.

The Department's faculty received two University Awards for Excellence at the 1998 Spring Commencement. Dr. Richard C. Hulbert received the Excellence in Research Award and Dr. Gale A. Bishop was honored for his Excellence in Teaching. This was Dr. Bishop's fourth University Award for Excellence.

Dr. Rhodes assumed his role as the Department Chair on August 1, 1998. At the same time, Dr. Charles H. Trupe III began his tenure-track appointment in the structural geology line.

During the 1998-99, a search for a new tenure-track position in the geography program academic year did not identify a suitable candidate. Dr. Michael J. Breedlove was employed as a Visiting Assistant Professor of Geography for the 1999-2000 academic year.

### **1.2.6 NEW PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES (1998- )**

In fall 1999, Dean Solomon appointed an interdisciplinary *ad hoc* committee to advise him on creating a geographical information systems program at Georgia Southern. The committee, chaired by Dr. Rhodes, delivered its initial report in December 1999 and a final report the following spring. As a result of the committee's efforts a formal minor in GIS was approved in 2000. The Spatial Analysis and Geographical Information Systems (SAGIS) Laboratory opened in the Carruth Building in Fall 2000.

The Department completed the installation of a network of 6 monitoring wells in Spring 1999. The well field consists of 3 well clusters. Each cluster contains a deep and shallow well and each well is instrumented with a data logger that continuously records water level and temperature. Approximately \$33,000 in funding for this project was obtained through the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Course and Curriculum Development (CCD) and Instrument and Laboratory Improvement (ILI) programs and from matching Georgia Southern University contributions. The monitoring well network is intended for the instruction of both introductory environmental geology and upper division hydrogeology courses.

In March 2000, the National Weather Service (NWS) commissioned an official weather station on the Georgia Southern campus. Dr. Good worked with the NWS to finally put Statesboro on their maps and provide official weather data through the Internet.

At the end of the 1999-2000 academic year, the Department began holding an annual dinner and awards ceremony, the "GeoParty." Newly established awards included presentations for the Outstanding Geology Student and the Outstanding Geography Student. Other awards, from both students and faculty, were far less serious. Dr. Rich received the University Award for Excellence in Research at the Spring 2000 Commencement.

Dr. Richard Hulbert left Georgia Southern in June 2000 for a research/curatorial position at the Florida Museum of Natural History in Gainesville, Florida. Biogeographer and ecologist Dr. Susan K. Langley joined the tenure-track faculty in the Fall of 2000.

Physical geographer, Dr. Nancy J. Leathers and vertebrate paleontologist, Dr. Jonathan H. Geisler became part of the faculty in August 2001. Dr. Couch left Georgia Southern in the summer of 2001 for a faculty position at Young Harris College in the Georgia mountains. Mr. John C. Jacobs was a visiting instructor for the 2001-2002 academic year, temporarily filling Dr. Couch's position. Dr. Soren C. Larsen was selected to fill the tenure-track position beginning August 2002. Mr. Jacobs moved to another temporary position at Northwest Missouri State University.

The Department completed its Level III Strategic Plan in April 2002 with the stated strategic goal "to become generally recognized as the outstanding program for undergraduate studies in geology and geography in the University System of Georgia."

In March 2003, the space in the Herty Building to be vacated by the Department of Chemistry's move to a new facility was redistributed. The Department was assigned use of the entire first floor and about 40% of the ground floor and second floor. This additional space provided most of the faculty with research space for the first time in the history of the Department.

Dr. Nancy J. Leathers resigned her faculty position effective at the end of the 2002-2003 academic year. A search for a replacement was halted by budget cuts throughout the University System.

Dr. Daniel B. Good retired after 34 years of unbroken service to the Department and the University on May 31, 2003. Dr. Jason N. Dittmer, a political geographer who completed his PhD at Florida State University, assumed Dr. Good's line in human geography.

The most distant field trip sponsored by the Department occurred in May 2003 when students, faculty, and alumni spent 12 days in Hawaii. Led by Dr. Pranoti Asher and Dr. Michael Kelly, the trip focused on the volcanic geology of the islands.

On June 30, 2003, Dr. Vernon J. Henry resigned his position as Director of the Applied Coastal Research Laboratory and assumed the title of Adjunct Professor of Geology. Dr. Clark R. Alexander assumed the duties of the Director on an interim basis. During the fall semester 2003, Dean Anny Morrobel-Sosa changed the College's organizational plan to place the ACRL directly under the Dean.

As the 2003-2004 academic year began, three major goals were identified and all were accomplished. The first called for plans to utilize newly acquired space in Herty Hall. To this end, a Dr. Reichard established Hydrogeochemistry Lab and Dr. Asher and Dr. Kelly organized an X-Ray Analysis Lab with funds from a NSF ILI Grant. Working plans were produced for complete use of the new space, however, limited funding prevented any of the renovations. Replacement of the geography faculty position lost to budget cuts during the previous year was the second goal. The position was approved and a search was conducted for a GIS specialist. In January 2004, Mr. Wei Tu, a PhD candidate at Texas A&M University, accepted the position. The third goal was the approval of the Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Geography degree program. The Board of Regents approved implementation of the program in February 2004.

In April 2004, the Department began conducting a field trip to Tybee Island for introductory level geography and geology students. The field trip was organized and led by Dr. James S. Reichard and Dr. Clark Alexander. The optional trip will be conducted once a semester to provide an enrichment opportunity.

The long awaited renovations of the space formerly occupied by the Department of Chemistry began in the Summer 2004 and continued through most of the year with the work confined to the second floor and exclusively in the spaces to be used by the Department of Biology. The spaces for geography and geology programs were discussed and preliminary architectural drawings were drawn.

By the start of the Fall 2004 semester, renovation of the second floor for the Department of Biology was in full swing. Noise and dirt from the work dogged the Department throughout the fall semester and through the first two months of the Spring 2005 term. Planning for the space to be occupied by our Department was continuous for most of the academic year with the job finally going to bid in late May. To make way for the work, the Department scheduled classes in seven different buildings, with only the introductory geology labs and the mineralogy and petrology classes remaining in Herty. All faculty members with offices on the first floor of the building were also required to relocate to allow for removal of asbestos floor tiles laid when the building was constructed. The Department's office moved to the ground floor of Herty and the remainder of the faculty moved to Anderson Hall.

Change among the faculty was a second theme for the year. At the end of the second semester, Dr. Fredrick Rich accepted an offer to oversee the NSF-sponsored Partnership for the Reform of Science and Math Education (PRISM). Dr. Donald Thieme was hired to replace Dr. Rich's teaching during the Spring 2005 semester. Soon after the beginning of the Spring term, Dr. Soren C. Larsen accepted a position at the University of Missouri—Columbia and a search was begun to identify a temporary replacement. At the same time, the search for a tenure-track replacement for Dr. Susan K. Langley ended with the hire of Dr. Xingyou Zhang (PhD, University of Cincinnati). Dr. Zhang is a medical geographer who uses GIS extensively in his research. A search was also conducted to select a replacement for Dr. Rich for 2005-2006. Dr. Eleanor J. Camann, a new PhD from the University of North Carolina, was hired as a coastal geologist to fill the position. Ms. Jennifer Kopf (ABD, University of Kentucky) was hired in a temporary position to fill Dr. Larsen's line. Finally, Dr. Denise A. Battles accepted the position as the first dean of the College of Natural and Health Science at the University of Northern Colorado, ending her 15 year career at Georgia Southern.

During this busy year, the Department recorded a number of other accomplishments. In Fall 2004, the Department began to produce CD's for the introductory level geology laboratories. A milestone was reached in December 2004, when the number of geology and geography majors topped 100 for the first time in the Department's history. During Spring Break (March 2005), Dr. Mark R. Welford lead the Department's first field excursion to another country. Seventeen current and former students, three members of the Department's (Dittmer, Larsen, and Rhodes) faculty, and two friends spent a week in Ecuador learning about the country's geology and geography. The Department graduated 11 students at the Spring 2005 Commencement and Dr. Pranoti Asher was announced as the recipient of a University Award for Excellence in Teaching at the ceremony.

### 1.3 – STRATEGIC PLAN

The Department's Level III Strategic Plan is part of the overall strategic plan for the University. In April, 2000, Georgia Southern University adopted a Level I Strategic Plan with the explicitly stated goal that:

*Georgia Southern University will be recognized as one of the best public comprehensive universities in the country within the next ten years.*

To achieve this goal, the University has organized its activities around six themes:

- Academic Distinction
- Student-Centered University
- Technological Advancement
- Transcultural Opportunities
- Private and Public Partnerships
- Physical Environment

The Introduction to the Level II Academic Plan states:

*The Level I Strategic Plan for Georgia Southern University asserts, "academic distinction is the core of our vision to become a nationally recognized comprehensive university...Academic distinction reflects the quality and comprehensiveness of our academic programs and the manner in which we support and strengthen those programs...is manifested by an uncompromising expectation of excellence, a campus-wide focus on the development of an academic environment, the nurturing of a community of intellectualism, and a commitment to lifelong learning in a diverse and technological global environment. While the Level I plan outlines our strategic vision for the future, Level II plans provide the goals, action steps, and strategies needed to implement the Level I agenda. These implementation strategies will drive the specific tactics that individual units develop in their Level III plans.*

Strategic Planning at the Departmental level began with reviews of every academic program area. Reviews of the geology program and the geography program were completed in February 2001 (Appendix A1.1). The Department's Level III Strategic Plan was based upon the University's Level I plan, the Level II Plan for Academic Affairs (January 23, 2002), and, the program reviews. The plan was presented to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology on April 24, 2002. The complete document is included in Appendix A1.2.

*The major strategic objective of the Department of Geology and Geography is recognition as the best undergraduate geology and geography program in the University System of Georgia.*

Our goal is directly linked to that of the University and our tactics for achieving the goal are organized around the six strategic themes outlined above. To accomplish this goal, the faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography recognizes that all their work must be evaluated in terms of both quality and productivity.

This Handbook contains supplementary information in Appendices A1.3, A1.4, and A1.5 that focus on the characteristics of ideal and far less than ideal departments.

## **1.4 - DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL AND ORGANIZATION**

### **1.4.1 THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The Department Chair is the senior officer of the University in the Department. The Department Chair is appointed by the President of the University with the approval of the Board of Regents and serves at the pleasure of the Dean of the College, the Provost, and the President.

The Chair is responsible for the supervision of all personnel, resources, and activities in the Department. The Department Chair's major duties are to:

1. Make recommendations to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology on all personnel actions (hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion). The Chair also conducts annual reviews of the Department's faculty and recommends annual merit salary changes.
2. Assign teaching responsibilities and consult with the faculty in determining their service and research roles.
3. Manage the Department's budget.
4. Administer the Department office and its staff.
5. Represent the Department's programs, faculty, students, and interests to the remainder of the University and the broader community.

### **1.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY**

The Department's Administrative Secretary is currently the only full-time staff employee. The Administrative Secretary's major responsibilities are assigned by the Department Chair and include:

1. Acting as the main contact for interaction with other administrative offices.
2. Maintaining records of the Department's budget, current expenditures, inventory, personnel documents and deadlines, and student records.
3. Maintaining records related to course offerings, schedules, and enrollments.
4. Supervising students working in the Department's office.

The Administrative Secretary is not a secretary to the faculty. Individual faculty members are expected to manage their own correspondence, including telephone messages. General secretarial and clerical assistance is provided by student assistants, whom the Administrative Secretary supervises.

Although the Administrative Secretary may assist students in special registration for courses, the Secretary is not an academic advisor. Students contacting the Department's office for information on requirements, schedules, or majors will be referred to a member of the faculty.

### **1.4.3 LABORATORY DIRECTORS**

#### **Earth Science Computer Applications Laboratory (ESCAL)**

The ESCAL Director supervises the use of the laboratory, including staffing, scheduling, hardware and software maintenance, and security. The Director works with the chair to solicit funds from the University's Technology Fee for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing the lab. The Director reports to the Department Chair.

#### **Spatial Analysis and Geographical Information Systems (SAGIS) Laboratory**

The SAGIS Director supervises the use of the laboratory, including staffing, scheduling, hardware and software maintenance, and security. The Director is the liaison between the Office of Information Technology Outreach Services at the University of Georgia, which administers the ESRI site license for the University System, and the laboratory. The Director administers the installation of ESRI software across the campus and maintains the records necessary to document the installations. The Director reports to the Department Chair.

#### **Curator of Paleontology**

The Curator of Paleontology in the Georgia Southern Museum is a joint appointment held by a faculty member with academic rank in the Department. The joint appointment places 60% of the time in the Department and 40% in the Georgia Southern Museum. The actual division of time may vary from year to year depending on the needs of the Department and the Museum, but the intention is that this 60-40 split be the average distribution in any 3-5 year period. For accounting purposes, the faculty member will be considered 0.45 EFT in the Department and 0.30 EFT in the Museum.

Responsibilities include preparing, cataloguing, and acquiring specimens for the Museum. The collections include invertebrate and vertebrate fossils as well as a comparative collection of recent vertebrate skeletons. The Curator is also responsible for assisting visits to the collections by qualified scientists and for arranging any incoming or outgoing loans. Additional exhibit and service responsibilities are determined by the Director of the Georgia Southern Museum.

## 1.5 - THE FACULTY

The following list includes full-time tenure-track faculty, emeritus faculty, part-time and adjunct faculty. The faculty member's name is followed by his/her current rank and the year he/she joined the faculty.

### 1.5.1 TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

**Pranoti M. ASHER** Associate Professor of Geology (1997)

Field(s) of Specialization: Igneous Petrology and Geochemistry

Education: B.Sc. (Geology), Bombay (1984)  
M.Sc. (Geology), Bombay (1986)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Connecticut (1995)

**James H. DARRELL** Associate Professor of Geology (1970)

Field(s) of Specialization: Palynology, Geologic Education, Soft Rock Geology

Education: B.A. (Geology), Ohio Wesleyan(1964)  
M.S. (Geology), Tennessee (1966)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Louisiana State (1973)

**Jason N. DITTMER** Assistant Professor of Geography (2003)

Field(s) of Specialization: Political geography, European geography

Education: B.A. (Political Science and International Studies), Jacksonville (1998)  
M.A. (International Affairs), Florida State (1999)  
Ph.D. (Geography), Florida State (2003)

**Jonathan H. GEISLER** Assistant Professor of Geology (2001), Curator of Paleontology

Field(s) of Specialization: Vertebrate Paleontology, Stratigraphy, Paleoceanography

Education: B.S. (Geology), Charleston (1995)  
B.A. (Biology), Charleston (1995)  
M.A. (Earth and Environmental Science), Columbia (1998)  
M.P. (Earth and Environmental Science), Columbia (2000)  
Ph.D. (Earth and Environmental Science), Columbia (2000)

**James S. REICHARD** Associate Professor of Geology (1996)

Field(s) of Specialization: Hydrogeology

Education: B.S. (Geology), Toledo (1981)  
M.S. (Geology), Toledo (1984)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Purdue (1995)

**Dallas D. RHODES** Professor of Geology (1998), Chair, Department of Geology and Geography

Field(s) of Specialization: Geomorphology, Neotectonics, GIS and Remote Sensing

Education: B.S. (Geology), Missouri (1969)  
M.A. (Geology), Syracuse (1973)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Syracuse (1973)

**Fredrick J. RICH** Professor of Geology (1988)

Field(s) of Specialization: Palynology, Coal Geology

Education: B.S. (Geology), Wisconsin (1973)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Penn State (1979)

**Charles H. TRUPE** Associate Professor of Geology (1998)

Field(s) of Specialization: Structural Geology, Tectonics, Metamorphic Petrology

Education: B.S. (Geology), George Mason (1985)  
M.S. (Geology), North Carolina (1989)  
Ph.D. (Geology), North Carolina (1997)

**Wei TU** Assistant Professor of Geography (2004)

Field(s) of Specialization: GIS and Spatial Analysis, Environmental Policy and Management, Urban Development and Environmental Issues in Asia and the Pacific Rim

Education: B.S. (Geography), East China Normal University (1992)  
M.S. (Geography), East China Normal University (1995)  
Ph.D. (Geography), Texas A&M University (2005)

**R. Kelly VANCE** Associate Professor of Geology (1988)

Field(s) of Specialization: Economic Geology, Igneous Petrology, Geochemistry

Education: B.S. (Geology), Kentucky (1978)  
M.S. (Geology), Kentucky (1984)  
Ph.D. (Geology), New Mexico Tech (1989)

**Mark R. WELFORD** Associate Professor of Geography (1993)

Field(s) of Specialization: Biogeography, Geomorphology

Education: B.Sc. (Geography), Coventry (1986)  
M.Sc. (Geography), Idaho (1988)  
Ph.D. (Geography), Illinois (1993)

**Xingyou ZHANG**, Assistant Professor of Geography (2005)

Field(s) of Specialization: Medical Geography, GIS

Education: B.S., (Geography), Hunan Normal University (1993)  
M.S., (Geography), Lanzhou University (1996)  
M.S., (Statistics), University of Cincinnati (2003)  
Ph.D., (Geography) University of Cincinnati (2004)

## 1.5.2 EMERITUS FACULTY

**Gale A. BISHOP** Emeritus Professor of Geology (1971)

Field(s) of Specialization: Invertebrate Paleontology

Education: B.S. (Geology), South Dakota School of Mines and Technology (1965)  
M.S. (Geology), South Dakota School of Mines and Technology (1967)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Texas (1971)

**Daniel B. GOOD** Emeritus Professor of Geography (1969)

Field(s) of Specialization: Historical Geography, Conservation, Meteorology

Education: B.A. (Economics), Emory & Henry (1965)  
M.S. (Geography), Tennessee (1967)  
Ph.D. (Geography), Tennessee (1972)

**H. Stanley HANSON** Emeritus Professor of Geology (1966)

Field(s) of Specialization: Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology, Structure and Geochemistry, Arid and Glacial Geomorphology

Education: B.A. (Chemistry), Emory (1949)  
M.A. (Geology), Emory (1959)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Arizona (1966)

### 1.5.3 PART-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY

**Clark R. ALEXANDER Jr.** Interim Director, Applied Coastal Research Laboratory (2003), Adjunct Professor of Geology (1994)

Field(s) of Specialization: Shallow Marine Sedimentation, Coastal Erosion. Historical records of anthropogenic impacts on the coastal zone.

Education: B.S. (Oceanography), Humboldt State (1983)  
B.A. (Geology), Humboldt State (1983)  
M.S. (Geology), North Carolina State (1985)  
Ph.D. (Geology), North Carolina State (1990)

**Vernon J. HENRY** Adjunct Professor of Geology (1991)

Field(s) of Specialization: Sedimentology, Coastal Geology.

Education: B.S. (Geology), Lamar State (1953)  
M.S. (Oceanography), Texas A&M (1955)  
Ph.D. (Oceanography), Texas A&M (1961)

**Michael S. KELLEY** Research Scientist (2002)

Field(s) of Specialization: Planetary Geology

Education: B.S. (Geology), Connecticut (1989)  
M.S. (Geology), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (1995)  
Ph.D. (Geology), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (1999)

**Sherry D. RICH** Part-Time Instructor (2000)

Education: B.S. (Geology), Dickinson (1974)  
M.S. (Geology), Penn State (1984)

## **1.5.4 UNIVERSITY AWARDS TO GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY FACULTY**

### **Georgia Southern University Awards for Excellence**

#### *Instruction*

1985-1986 – Daniel B. Good  
1999-2000 – Gale A. Bishop  
2004-2005 – Pranoti M. Asher

#### *Research*

1985-1986 – Gale A. Bishop  
1992-1993 – Gale A. Bishop  
1999-2000 – Richard C. Hulbert  
2001-2002 – Fredrick J. Rich

#### *Service*

1988-1989 – Gale A. Bishop  
1990-1991 – Daniel B. Good

## **1.6 - MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY**

### **1.6.1 REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY**

Shared governance of the Department requires regular meetings of the faculty. General faculty meetings will be called by the Department Chair approximately once a month during the academic year. Additional meetings may be held as necessary to conduct the Department's business. Notice of meetings and a call for agenda items will be given in advance.

### **1.6.2 PARTICIPATION AND VOTING IN FACULTY MEETINGS**

All members of faculty, regardless of the type of appointment they hold, are encouraged to attend and participate in Faculty Meetings.

Voting rights are reserved for full-time tenure-track faculty. Only full-time tenured faculty may participate in reappointment, pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion proceedings.

Faculty who are on leave or who have been assigned to other locations and are unable to attend faculty meetings regularly will be excused from participation.

### **1.6.3 TIME AND LOCATION OF MEETINGS**

Regular meetings of the faculty will be held on Thursday afternoons at 4 pm in Room 1107. *Because shared governance requires active participation by the entire faculty, no member of the Department should schedule any other activity at this time.* Except in unusual circumstances, the meetings of the faculty will last one hour.

### **1.6.4 FIRST MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR**

The first faculty meeting of the academic year will be held late in the week before classes begin. The exact time of the gathering will be determined by the Fall Semester Meeting of the Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs. Faculty can expect the First Meeting to last 2-3 hours, during which the Chair will review the previous year and set the major agenda items for the coming year. Attendance at this meeting is expected of all members of the faculty. *Faculty are expected to manage their summer schedules so they will be available between Wednesday and Friday of the week before classes commence.*

### **1.6.5 MINUTES OF THE FACULTY MEETINGS**

During the first faculty meeting of the year, a recorder will be selected to take the minutes of the faculty's meetings. The recorder will submit the minutes to the Department Chair as soon as possible after the meeting. After proofreading, the Chair will distribute the minutes to all faculty and the Dean of the College of Science and Technology. Minutes will be maintained on file permanently in the Department Office.

## **1.7 – COMMITTEES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY**

### **1.7.1 PERMANENT COMMITTEES OF THE DEPARTMENT**

In order to facilitate and coordinate the many activities necessary for the Department to function, responsibilities for specific areas and tasks are given to committees and individuals. The Department is also represented by faculty on a number of committees within the College of Science and Technology and the University.

#### **Curriculum Committee**

The Curriculum Committee is appointed by the Department Chair and consists of at least five members, two geographers, two geologists, and the committee chair. Meetings of the committee are open to any member of the faculty.

The Curriculum Committee proposes and reviews changes in the following areas:

1. Department's course offerings (addition or deletion of courses from the University catalog).
2. Requirements for degrees
3. Requirements for honors
4. Requirements for minors

After due consideration of proposed changes or additions to the Department's curricula and course offerings, the Committee brings specific proposals to the faculty for final decisions.

The chair of the committee is responsible for preparing the paperwork necessary for College- and University-wide approval and adoption of curricular changes. The committee chair is expected to attend meetings of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to present the Department's rationale for the changes. The chair of the committee also serves as the Department's representative to the COST Curriculum Committee.

#### **Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committees**

See Section 2.1.11 for a complete description of these committees.

#### **Facilities Committee**

The Facilities Committee is chaired by the Department Chair and includes at least four other members of the faculty. Two geographers and two geologists may volunteer or be appointed to the committee. The purpose of the committee is to plan and monitor the use of all spaces assigned to the Department. Meetings of the Facilities Committee are open to any member of the faculty.

### **1.7.2 AD HOC COMMITTEES OF THE DEPARTMENT**

#### **Search Committees**

Search Committees are appointed by the Department Chair. The committee usually consists of 4 members of the faculty. The committee chair and two of the members will come from the discipline in which the new faculty member is being sought. The fourth member will

be from the other discipline. For example, if a new professor of geography is the object of the search, the chair of the committee and two of the members will be geographers. The fourth member will be a geologist.

Search Committees and their chairs work with the Department Chair to:

1. Prepare the position description.
2. Produce a recruitment strategy.
3. Make arrangements to advertise the position in print, on the Web, through direct mailings, at professional meetings, and informally.
4. Screen applicants based on the approved position description.
5. Evaluate the applicants and recommend among those qualified to fill the position which should be brought to campus for an interview.
6. Act as hosts for candidates during their campus visit.
7. Gather information from all constituencies who have contact with the candidates during their visit.
8. Evaluate the candidates and recommend a candidate for appointment.

Recruitment is an essential part of the search process. The Department always hopes to make the best possible impression during an interview. At the least, this means that another professional geographer or geologist knows about this Department and what we are doing. Most importantly, it means that the Department will stand the best possible chance of having offers accepted by our first-choice candidates. See Appendix A1.6 for an additional perspective on how to conduct a search.

### **Hanson and Good Scholarship Selection Committee**

The committee meets annually to select the recipients of the Hanson (geology) scholarship and the Good (geography) scholarship. The coordinator is responsible for announcing the competition for the scholarships, distributing application forms, and completing the required paperwork for the Georgia Southern University Foundation.

## **1.7.3 OTHER DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITIES**

### **Alumni Relations Coordinator – Vance**

The Coordinator maintains liaison between the Department, the Office of Alumni Relations, and former students. He/she is responsible for up-dating alumni materials for the Department's Administrative Secretary and Web site coordinator. The Alumni Relations Coordinator is responsible for coordinating with the Homecoming Committee any events that relate to Departmental alumni.

### **Annual Giving Coordinator – Rich**

The coordinator distributes information to the faculty and staff about the annual "A Day for Southern" fund drive, the United Way, and other giving opportunities. The Coordinator collects the contributions from faculty and staff and delivers them to the proper campus representative.

**Audio Visual Equipment Coordinator - Reichard**

The Coordinator is responsible for inventory, safekeeping, maintenance, and coordination of usage of all Departmental audio/visual equipment including VCR's, monitors, overhead projectors, slide projectors, ELMO, and other electronic teaching tools.

**Department Newsletter Editor(s) – Asher and Geisler**

The Editor coordinates the production, publication, and distribution of a newsletter to University officials, faculty, alumni, friends, and supporters of the Department.

**Environmental Geology Laboratory Coordinator – Reichard**

The Environmental Geology Laboratory Coordinator is responsible for revision of the Environmental Geology Lab Manual, special mineral collections, water sampling equipment, soil samples and sampling equipment, earthquake models, and maps.

**Faculty Handbook Coordinator – Rhodes**

The Coordinator is responsible for the maintenance of the Department of Geology and Geography Faculty Handbook. The coordinator periodically seeks additional inputs and up-dates the handbook annually.

**Good and Hanson Scholarships – Asher**

The Coordinator promotes fundraising for the scholarships and maintains records of giving. He/she works closely with the Georgia Southern University Foundation. In February of each year the Coordinator advertises the scholarships, seeks applicants, and arranges an informal committee of at least three faculty members to make their recommendation to the Coordinator. The Coordinator works directly with the Georgia Southern University Honors Committee and Georgia Southern University Foundation for the award presentation and provision of scholarship monies.

**Internship Coordinator – Tu**

The Internship Coordinator is responsible for organizing and administering student internships. The Coordinator actively pursues internships for the Department. The Coordinator administers internship applications and oversees student interns' work.

**Laboratory Safety Officer – Reichard**

The Laboratory Safety Officer helps ensure that the Department's research and teaching laboratories meet current safety standards and also updates the chemical inventories. This work is done under the direction of the University's Director of Environmental Safety.

**Mineral and Rock Collection Curator – Vance**

The Curator maintains and inventories the Department's teaching and display collections.

**Peer Evaluation of Teaching Coordinator – Rich**

The Coordinator is a tenured member of the faculty who organizes and supervises the peer evaluation of teaching process. The Coordinator is responsible for organizing review teams, and building consensus to produce the evaluation that is provided to the faculty member.

**Physical Geology Laboratory Coordinator - Vance**

The Physical Geology Laboratory Coordinator is responsible for maintaining maps, mineral, and rock collections for the introductory physical geology laboratories. The Coordinator works with faculty to ensure that rock and mineral samples, and other materials are organized and available for each semester and synchronizes test dates.

**Seminar Coordinators – Dittmer and Kelley**

The Coordinators recruit and schedule speakers for the Department's Seminar Series each semester. Suggestions from all faculty for potential speakers are welcome. The Coordinators also arrange the on-campus visits and meals.

**Senior Academic Advisor – Darrell**

The Senior Academic Advisor is the major source of information for advising of majors and programs supportive of the majors. The Senior Academic Advisor advises the Department Chair on issues related to student welfare. The Senior Advisor assists the Chair with administrative aspects of the Department's academic programs and works closely with other faculty in matters relating to student advisement.

**Sample Preparation Laboratory Supervisor – Vance**

The Supervisor maintains the sample preparation laboratory and its equipment, coordinates lab use, and trains students in the safe use of the equipment.

**Student Handbook Coordinator – Trupe**

The Coordinator is responsible for the annual revision and printing of the Department of Geology and Geography Student Handbook. The Coordinator periodically seeks additional inputs, up-dates the handbook as needed, and works with the Web Site Coordinator to assure that the latest revision of the manual is available on-line.

**Teaching Evaluations Coordinator - Geisler**

The Coordinator is responsible for administering student ratings of instruction for all courses each semester according to guidelines established by the Office of the Provost.

**Weather Station Coordinator – Vance**

The Coordinator is responsible for the operation, maintenance, and up grading of the Georgia Southern University Weather Station and its Web site. The Coordinator provides historical weather data to various campus and non-campus organizations.

**Web Site Coordinator – Asher**

The Web Coordinator is responsible for maintaining the Department's web site (<http://www2.gasou.edu/geog/G%26G.html>).

**Well Field Coordinator - Reichard**

The Well Field Coordinator is responsible for the maintenance of wells, sampling equipment, and electronic data recording system. The Coordinator also keeps records of water levels for use in classroom.

## **1.7.4 COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEES**

### **Tenure and Promotion Committee - Rich**

The committee meets on an annual basis. As soon as tenure and promotion dossiers have been received from the Department Chairs and are determined to be complete, the committee is convened by the Dean. The Dean explains the function of the committee, gives it its charge, and the committee chooses a chair. A date is set for one more meeting at which the committee will review the applications. Committee members are free to review documents at their leisure, and access to the dossiers is customarily provided at all reasonable hours. Upon completion of their reviews, the committee members submit their personal opinions. These are gathered by the Dean, and the committee members meet at the predetermined date to discuss the content of the dossiers. Discussions are typically open and frank, and provide a means by which information concerning individuals can be exchanged. In each case, the committee makes a recommendation to the Dean, who considers the committee's opinion in making a recommendation to the Provost.

### **Post Tenure Review Committee -**

The Post-Tenure Review Committee functions in much the same fashion as the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Dossiers at this level of consideration can be rather large, including several years' evidence of activity in teaching, service, and professional development. After receiving its charge, the committee elects a chair, dossiers are reviewed, and deliberations are held at a pre-determined date. The committee makes a recommendation to the Dean, and the Dean uses that information in combination with his/her own opinion and the evaluation by the department chair to make a recommendation to the Provost.

### **Course and Curriculum Committee – Asher**

The Committee meets at least eight times a year approximately 5-10 days before each Georgia Southern Undergraduate Committee meeting. One week prior to each Course and Curriculum Committee meeting, departmental representatives submit curriculum changes from his/her own department to the committee chair via e-mail. At the meeting, all the curriculum items presented are discussed and votes cast to: recommend with changes, recommend without changes, or be denied. The successful items are forwarded to the University's Undergraduate Committee for their consideration.

### **Dean's Advisory Council – Trupe**

The advisory council meets on the 3rd Wednesday of every month (from 3:30-5:00 pm) to discuss issues pertaining to the College with the Dean. Each departmental representative brings agenda items from his/her own department for discussion. The representative takes notes during the meeting and distributes them to the faculty via email.

### **College Teaching Award - Welford**

The Committee recommends a COST faculty member for the College Teaching Award that recognizes excellence in teaching. Awards are given based on an evaluation of a professor's academic teaching career at Georgia Southern. Committee members base their decision on dossiers submitted by nominees. The Dean's office arranges a time for the first meeting.

**College Service Award -**

The committee recommends a COST faculty member for the College Service Award recognizing achievement in the advancement of the College. The committee is composed of 7 faculty members from COST, including a representative from the Department of Geology and Geography. Committee members base their decision on dossiers submitted by nominees. The Dean's office arranges a time for the first meeting.

**College Research Award – Geisler**

The committee recommends a COST faculty member for the College Research Award recognizing achievement in the advancement or application of knowledge in science or technology. The committee is composed of 7 faculty members from COST, including a representative from the Department of Geology and Geography. Committee members base their decision on dossiers submitted by nominees. The Dean's office arranges a time for the first meeting.

**Academic Excellence Committee - Trupe**

The COST Academic Excellence program exists to help support faculty and student activities and/or purchases that promote excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The Academic Excellence Committee is composed of a COST assistant or associate dean, who chairs the committee, and five COST faculty members. Faculty committee members are elected by the COST faculty and serve two-year terms. The Committee meets twice annually (fall and spring) to review proposals, and forwards funding recommendations to the Dean. The Academic Excellence program typically distributes \$5,000 annually; most individual awards are no more than \$500.

**1.7.5 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES****Department Library Representative – Darrell**

Each year the Department is allocated funds from the library for library acquisitions. These can be books, periodicals, videos, CD's, and other scholarly materials. The purpose of the coordinator is to receive recommendations from the faculty for acquisition to the library holdings benefiting geology/geography students and faculty. The Coordinator attends meetings of the university-wide Library Committee as representative of the Department of Geology and Geography.

**Graduate Coordinator – Reichard**

This committee meets twice a semester to discuss issues related to Georgia Southern's graduate program. Although the Department of Geology and Geography does not currently offer a graduate degree, opportunities do exist for our faculty to help direct thesis projects for graduate students in related disciplines. The Department's coordinator attends Graduate Program Directors/Coordinators meetings and reports back to our faculty on new developments related to University's Graduate Program.

**Teacher Education Quality Assurance Coordinator – Darrell**

The Teacher Education Quality Assurance Coordinators were created in response to a Board of Regents' initiative for all education graduates (undergraduate and graduate program grads) to be "guaranteed" by the institution. The Program for Assuring Quality (PAQ) responds

to that need. The Coordinators are the unit's contact person if the University receives a call from a school superintendent that a Georgia Southern education graduate is not being successful.

## 1.8 - GENERALIZED ANNUAL ACADEMIC CALENDAR

### August

1	Official employment date
1	Deadline for reappointment of 3 <sup>rd</sup> through 6 <sup>th</sup> year faculty
Mon, second week	Official start of academic year
Wed, second week, am	University Convocation
Wed, second week, pm	COST General Faculty Meeting
Thu, second week, pm	First Department Meeting
third week	Fall Semester classes begin
third week	Contributions to Department Newsletter due

### September

1	Submit travel plans for academic year to Department Chair
first Mon	Labor Day (University closed)
second week	“A Day for Southern” annual giving campaign
~15	Deadline for submission of ICAPP proposals
15 or prior	Deadline for notifying faculty subject to Pre-Tenure Review
15 or prior	Deadline for notifying faculty subject to Post-Tenure Review
mid	Grants for Development of Instruction application deadline
mid	Spring Semester Course Schedule due
third week	Professional Travel Requests application deadline

### October

1	Submit Tenure and Promotion applications to Department Chair
a weekend	Homecoming, Classes cancelled after 2 pm on Friday
15	Graduate Faculty application deadline
30	Tenure and Promotion recommendations to Dean

### November

1	Deadline for reappointment of 2 <sup>nd</sup> year faculty
~1	Educational Leave application deadline (first round)
first week	Abstracts due for Posters at the Legislative Wild Game Supper
last Wed, Thu, Fri	Thanksgiving Holiday (University closed)

### December

first Fri	Fall Semester classes end
second Fri	Fall Commencement
25, week of	Winter Holidays (University closed)

### January

first Mon (not Jan 1)	Start of Spring Semester
second week	First call for interest in teaching summer school
~15	Deadline for submission of materials for Pre-Tenure Review
~15	Deadline for submission of materials for Post-Tenure Review
~15	Faculty Annual Reports due to Department Chair
mid	Professional Travel Requests application deadline

third Mon  
fourth week

Martin Luther King Day (University closed)  
Educational Leave application deadline (second round)

## February

1

Deadline for reappointment of 1<sup>st</sup> year faculty

1

University deadline for timely resignation from the faculty

~1

Nominations for Awards of Excellence deadline

first week

Summer and Fall Semesters Course Schedules due

~15

Pre-Tenure Review recommendations due to Dean

~15

Faculty Annual Reviews due to Dean

~15

Faculty Development Summer Awards application deadline

15

Graduate Faculty application deadline

## March

first week

Award for Excellence in Instruction nomination deadline

usually mid month

Spring Break

last week

Determine Department's student awards recipients

## April

first Wed

Honors Day (no morning classes)

Thu, last full week of classes

Final Department Meeting

Fri, last full week of classes

Annual Department Party (GeoParty)

## May

1

Deadline for consulting Chair on early tenure applications

first week

Faculty complete Annual Inventory and submit to Chair

first week

Request for faculty contributions to Annual Report

first week

Request for additions to Department Wish List

first Sat

Spring Commencement

## June

mid

Department's Annual Report due to Dean

30

End of Fiscal Year

## July

1

Start of new Fiscal Year

31

End of academic year

## **1.9 - DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORT**

The University requires every academic unit to submit an annual report. Starting in 1998, the reports cover the previous calendar year, not the academic year. The Department Chair is responsible for producing the Department's annual report, which is generally due in the Dean's office in early to mid-June. To meet this deadline and accommodate summer schedules, the Chair will ask faculty to make their contributions to the report near the end of the academic year.

Copies of the Department's Annual Report will be distributed to all members of the faculty. These reports should be retained for future reference. Archival copies of the reports are retained in the Department office.

## **1.10 – PUBLICATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT**

### **1.10.1 THE DEPARTMENT WEB SITE**

The Department of Geology and Geography Web site is the largest and most comprehensive body of public information about the Department's faculty, students, facilities, and curriculum. The web site URL is: <http://cost.georgiasouthern.edu/geo/>. General correspondence and publications about the Department should reference our site.

### **1.10.2 DEPARTMENT BROCHURE**

The Department has produced an advertising piece that is used for recruiting and general publicity. The latest revision and printing occurred in Spring 2000.

### **1.10.3 GIS PROGRAM BROCHURE**

The general information piece on the GIS Program was produced and printed in Spring 2001.

### **1.10.4 ANNUAL NEWSLETTER**

The Annual Newsletter is primarily a vehicle for maintaining contact with alumni and friends of the Department. The newsletter is produced during the fall and covers the previous academic year and the summer just ended. In order to mail the newsletter during late November or early December, faculty need to submit their contributions *before the first day of classes of the fall semester*.

### **1.10.5 FACULTY HANDBOOK**

The Department's Faculty Handbook is the working guide for the faculty. The Department Chair is charged with maintaining the Handbook, bringing revisions before the faculty for consideration, and issuing annual supplements and amendments.

### **1.10.6 STUDENT HANDBOOK**

The Department's Student Handbook provides students a formal source for information about the Department and its policies. Geology and Geography majors are expected to read the Handbook and to be knowledgeable of those sections that apply to them. Revisions to the Handbook are brought to the faculty for approval.

### **1.10.7 ENVIRONMENTAL GEOLOGY AND EARTH LAB MANUALS**

These manuals were written by the faculty for use in Environmental Geology and The Earth. Annual revision of the manuals is the responsibility of the appointed editor. Proceeds from the sale of the manuals are deposited in the Department's general foundation account.

## **1.11 – FOUNDATION ACCOUNTS**

### **1.11.1 THE DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY FUND**

This is the Department's general foundation account. It is used for a variety of purposes including support of student travel for field trips and conferences and the annual awards dinner. This fund receives proceeds from the sale of the Environmental Geology Laboratory Manual.

### **1.11.2 THE H. STANLEY HANSON GEOLOGY SCHOLARSHIP**

This scholarship honors the career and services of former Department head, H. Stanley Hanson. The purpose is to provide a means by which outstanding geology majors can be recruited, recognized, and assisted. The first award was made in 1993.

### **1.11.3 THE DANIEL GOOD GEOGRAPHY SCHOLARSHIP**

This scholarship was established by Dr. Dan Good to award scholarships to qualified geography majors. The first award was made in 2003.

### **1.11.4 THE RICHARD M. PETKEWICH SERVICE AWARD**

This award was established in honor of Dr. Petkewich's many years of unselfish service to the Department and the Georgia Southern Museum. This fund needs a minimum endowment of \$15,000 to begin making awards. The Petkewich Award is administered by the Director of the Georgia Southern Museum.

## 1.12 – FACILITIES

### 1.12.1 – FACILITIES OVERVIEW

The space assigned to the Department is located in three buildings: the Herty Building, Anderson Hall, and the Information Technology Building. The Department also has access to the University's Applied Coastal Research Laboratory on the campus of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. Members of the faculty teach classes in a variety of general-purpose rooms across the campus.

### 1.12.2 – ACCESS [See <http://services.georgiasouthern.edu/facilities/keycontrol.htm>]

Since 2003, access to buildings on campus other than during business hours is via codes incorporated into the University identification card. One outside door on each building is fitted with an electronic lock that is deactivated by swiping a properly coded identification card. Every building on campus has separate controls and access to each requires that the individual (faculty, staff, and students) complete a form that must be approved by both the home department chair and the Building Supervisor. The completed form and the individual's Georgia Southern University identification card must be submitted to the Lock Shop where the card will be programmed to provide entry to the building.

Access to rooms requires keys that are issued through the University. A form must be completed and signed by both the home department chair and the Building Supervisor. When completed the form is submitted to the Key Bank, which is located in the Lock Shop of the Structural Maintenance Department within the Physical Plant Division.

### 1.12.3 – HERTY BUILDING

Most of the Department is housed in the Herty Building. The Chair of the Department is the "Building Supervisor." The following table lists the rooms assigned to the Department, its uses, and the faculty member responsible for the room and its contents (see Section 3.1 on Inventory).

Room	Responsibility	Current Use
0100A	Rich	St. Catherine Island Sea Turtle Program Storage
0100B	Geisler	Dark Room
0104	Reichard	Office and Hydrogeochemistry Laboratory
0105	Asher	X-Ray Analysis Laboratory
1100	Warren	Conference Room (awaiting renovation)
1100A	Rhodes	Office (awaiting renovation)
1100C	Warren	Storage (awaiting renovation)
1100D	Warren	Server Room (awaiting renovation)
1101	Reichard	Geology and Geography Lecture Room
1102A	Darrell	Office
1103	Vance	Introductory Level Geology Lab
1103A	Vance	Storage
1104A	Warren	Faculty Work Room
1104B	Vance	Office
1104C	Rich	Office
1105A	Vance	Storage
1106	Vance	Introductory Level Geology Lab

1107	Welford	Department Conference and Seminar Room
1110	Warren	Department Office
1110A	Rhodes	Department Chair's Office
1110B	Warren	File Room
1110C	Warren	Administrative Secretary's Office
1110D	Warren	Student Assistant
1111	Asher	Hard Rock Classroom Laboratory
1111B	Asher	Microscopy Laboratory
1113	Asher	Storage (awaiting renovation)
1114	Trupe	Earth Science Computer Applications Laboratory
1115	Tu	Storage (awaiting renovation)
1116	Geisler	Georgia Southern Museum Paleontology Collections
1116C	Geisler	Office (awaiting renovation)
1117	Geisler	Paleontology Laboratory
1118	Darrell	Soft Rock Classroom and Laboratory
1119	Vance	Rock Preparation Laboratory
2100	Rhodes	Faculty Offices (awaiting renovation)
2108	Rhodes	Faculty Offices (awaiting renovation)
2112	Rhodes	Teaching Laboratory (awaiting renovation)
2113	Rhodes	Research Laboratory (awaiting renovation)
2115	Rhodes	Research Laboratory (awaiting renovation)
2116	Rhodes	Research Laboratory (awaiting renovation)

#### 1.12.4 – ANDERSON HALL

Anderson Hall (one of the University's original residence halls) is divided between administrative offices (e.g., Office of Financial Aid) and faculty offices. The geography and geology faculty with offices in Anderson Hall will move to new offices in the Herty Building when the required renovations are completed.

The Anderson Hall Building Supervisor is Ms. Connie Murphey in the Office of Financial Aid.

Room	Responsibility	Current Use
2006	Tu	Office
2008	Welford	Office
2009		Office
2010	Trupe	Office
2011	Zhang	Office
2012	Dittmer	Office
2013	Rich, S.	Office
2014		Office
3002	Kelley	Office
3021	Asher	Office

#### 1.12.5 – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (GIS Laboratory)

The Information Technology Building houses the teaching laboratory for geographic information science (Room 2204). The Department supervises the use of this room and is responsible for supplying it.

## **1.13 –EQUIPMENT**

### **1.13.1 – OFFICE AND GENERAL PURPOSE EQUIPMENT**

#### Digital Cameras

- Canon G2 Digital Camera [Warren]
- Canon Rebel SLR [Vance]
- SONY Cyber-Shot Digital Camera [Geisler]
- Nikon D70 SLR Digital Camera [Rhodes]

FAX Machines (Department Office and Faculty Work Room)

Copier (Main copier in Faculty Work Room)

### **1.13.2 – COMPUTER PERIPHERALS**

#### Plotters (ESCAL and IT GIS Lab)

- HP 3500 CP color inkjet plotter (54 inch width)
- HP 455 CA color inkjet plotter (36 inch width)

HP 8550N Color LaserJet Printer (networked) (Faculty Work Room)

#### Large Format Scanners (ESCAL)

- Umax 11 x 17 inch scanner with batch slide scanning capability
- Ideal FSC 8010 – drum scanner that will scan up to 36 inches wide

Polaroid SprintScan 35 Plus Slide Scanner (ESCAL)

Polaroid HR 6000 Digital Palette Film Writer (ESCAL)

### **1.13.3 – FIELD EQUIPMENT**

#### Communications

- 2 Motorola CT250 two-way radios (with chargers) [Rhodes]

#### Current Meter

- Swoffer Model 2100 Flow Meter (w/rod, cables, spare propellers) [Welford]

#### Dissolved Oxygen Meter

- Freshwater / Saltwater DO meter [Reichard]

#### Global Positioning System (GPS)

##### GPS Receivers

- 2 Trimble GeoExplorer II receivers (with covers, chargers and cables) [Rhodes]
- 5 Trimble GeoExplorer GeoXT receivers (with peripherals) [Rhodes]
- 2 Topcon Magellan receivers (with peripherals) [Welford]
- 4 Garmin E-Trex receivers [Rhodes]

##### External antennae

- 1 External antenna for Trimble GeoExplorer II [Rhodes]
- 1 External antenna for Trimble GeoExplorer GeoXT [Rhodes]

Differential GPS

2 Trimble Beacon-On-A-Belt (BoB) [Rhodes]

Miscellaneous

Pole mount for external antenna [Rhodes]

Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) System

MALÅ X3M GeoExplorer [Vance]

Antenna: 100 MHz, 250 MHz, 500 MHz, 800 MHz

Magnetic Susceptibility Meter

ZH Instruments SM-30 Magnetic Susceptibility Meter [Rhodes]

Geiger Counter

RDX1 Nuclear Radiation Monitor [Vance]

Samplers (Water)

2 ISCO 3700 Auto Samplers [Welford]

Van Dorn bottle [Reichard]

Samplers (Biological)

Dip net

Kick net

Compasses

27 Brunton Pocket Transits [Trupe]

Surveying Instruments

Wild T1010 electronic theodolite [Rhodes]

Wild DI1001 electronic distance meter (EDM) [Rhodes]

Topcon AT-G6 Auto Level (w/ one metric and two standard surveying poles) [Welford]

Tape Measures

Tape [Rhodes]

Tape Recording

Marantz PMD 222 tape recorder [Welford]

Sennheiser ME66 short shotgun omni-directional microphone [Welford]

Olympus VN-3600 voice recorder [Dittmer]

Waders

Insulated chest waders (size 12) [Welford]

Miscellaneous

Shovels, picks, and various excavating implements [Geisler]

Sears, 20-gallon, 3 HP air compressor [Geisler]

Briggs & Stratton 3.5 HP Water Pump with hoses [Geisler]

Craftsman large Shop-Vac [Geisler]

### **1.13.4 – LABORATORY EQUIPMENT**

#### Rock Prep Equipment [Vance]

- Large rock saw
- Cut-off rock saw
- Trim saw
- Buehler resectioning/grinding machine
- Buehler thin section polisher
- Rock tumblers (2)
- Large vibratory polisher
- Lap wheels (3)
- Hydraulic sample splitter
- Vibratory sieve shaker and sieve set

#### Ion Chromatography [Herty 0104, Reichard]

#### X-Ray Diffraction [Herty 0105, Asher and Vance]

- Rigaku MiniFlex X-Ray Diffraction Unit with Jade software (Geochemistry Lab)
- Spex Certiprep Mixer/Mill 8000M (Geochemistry Lab)
  - Alumina Ceramic vial set
  - Tungsten Carbide vial set
- XRD Sample Preparation peripherals and expendables (Geochemistry Lab)

#### Microscopy [Herty 1111 and 1111A, Vance and Asher]

- Olympus Petrographic Research Scope with digital and standard camera attachments
- Camera and monitor with trinocular head for Olympus petrographic scopes
- Portable short/long UV light
- Student Petrographic Scopes (Olympus, Leitz, Nikon)

## SECTION 2 FACULTY EMPLOYMENT

### 2.1 – PERSONNEL POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

*We judge ourselves by what we feel capable of doing, while others judge us by what we have already done. -- Longfellow*

#### 2.1.1 – OVERVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT’S PERSONNEL PROCESSES

##### Introduction

Evaluating our colleagues is the most professionally and personally demanding requirement of academic life. Judgment of peers requires each of us to reflect on our own disciplinary competency and record of accomplishment, the quality of our teaching, and personal preferences and values. No one can look into another’s heart or brain and know what is there. Evaluations and recommendations must be based on what can be seen and read. Facts, not assumption; products not plans; and actions, not thoughts, are the only responsible bases for conducting all personnel actions. Increasingly this has become a legal as well as a philosophical choice.

Among the many books available on the subject, “Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance” by Larry A. Braskamp and John C. Ory is particularly useful and has been consulted frequently in preparing this document. This, and other references, are listed at the end of this section of the Faculty Handbook.

##### Personnel Actions: Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Institutions of higher education use a variety of terms to describe their personnel processes. Although exact policies, expectations, and time tables vary, all of them must address three kinds of decisions—retention (or reappointment), tenure, and promotion (RTP). Outside the RTP process, there is a fourth personnel decision, which may be the most important: the recruitment and hiring of faculty. This document addresses each of these personnel actions in the order they most commonly occur, as reflected in the overview below.

##### Timeline of Personnel Actions

The following time line assumes that the faculty member comes to Georgia Southern University with no credit for previous experience. If credit for previous experience is granted as part of the initial employment contract, the time line is shifted accordingly.

As the University’s Faculty Handbook (see §209) states, early tenure is “extremely rare.” To qualify for early tenure, the candidate must have “outstanding” accomplishments in teaching, service, and research, and “there must be a compelling reason” for early tenure. Any faculty member considering an early application for tenure must consult with the Department Chair by May 1 in the calendar year the application will be made.

## Approximate Timeline of Personnel Actions

*NOTE:* This time line assumes initial hire as a tenure-track Assistant Professor.

### *The Hire (Year 0)*

### *Probationary Period (Typically years 1 through 6)*

#### Annual Reviews

##### *Possible Outcomes:*

- Reappointment – new contract granted
- Non-Reappointment – terminal contract

#### Pre-Tenure Review (Year 3)

##### *Possible Outcomes:*

- Reappointment – new contract granted
- Non-Reappointment – terminal contract

#### Final Tenure Review (Typically Year 6 and no earlier than year 5)

##### *Possible Outcomes:*

- Recommendation for Tenure
- Recommendation for Non-Renewal

#### Tenure or Terminal Appointment (Typically year 7, but not earlier than year 6)

#### Promotion to Associate Professor (Elective, typically year 7 or later)<sup>1</sup>

### *Post-Tenure Period (Year 6 or 7 onward)*

#### Annual Reviews

#### Promotion to Associate Professor (Elective, typically year 7 or later)<sup>1</sup>

#### Promotion to Professor (Elective)<sup>1</sup>

Must have at least 5 years in rank as associate professor

#### Post-Tenure Reviews (at least every 5 years or 5 years after last promotion)

##### *Possible Outcomes:*

- Meritorious – may be used to support grant and leave applications
- Satisfactory – no additional action
- Deficient – remedial actions required

<sup>1</sup> A promotion is considered early if the individual has served less than the following number of years in rank at Georgia Southern: 1) To Assistant Professor – 3 years, 2) To Associate Professor – 4 years, and 3) to Professor – 5 years.

### 2.1.2 - THE HIRE

*“First-rate faculty hire first-rate faculty and second-rate faculty hire third-rate faculty.” --Anonymous*

The most important personnel decision is the hire. If the right person is selected to fill the job almost everything else that is necessary will follow as a matter of due course. The responsibility for making a correct hire lies with the faculty (especially the appointed Search Committee) and the Department Chair. Any hire that is not made with the firm belief that the person has the background, skills, knowledge, and energy necessary to win tenure and promotion at Georgia Southern is a bad hire. No one should ever be appointed to a tenure-track position when there is serious doubt about that person's likely success. Practically, this means that *untenured members of the faculty should understand that they start their careers with their colleagues' support and belief in their ability to succeed*. The importance of this point cannot be overemphasized because it sets the tone for the entire tenure evaluation process.

The faculty of the Department of Geology and Geography expects that every new member of the faculty will succeed in earning tenure. This is not universally true. Tenure is a virtually unattainable goal in some institutions, often for reasons that have nothing to do with the individual under consideration. Tenure “quotas” are the most common cause. Although the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has a strongly worded statement opposing tenure quotas, some institutions have formal policies specifying the maximum percentage of any department may be tenured at one time. Many programs, even those without quotas, will resist having a fully tenured faculty, especially if there are no retirements on the horizon. More commonly there is an unwritten “policy” that makes it nearly impossible for the only untenured member of a department to receive a positive recommendation. Georgia Southern University has no tenure quota of any kind.

Since the 1998-99 academic year, the percentage of the Department of Geology and Geography's faculty who hold tenure has varied from 54%-64% (as of Fall 2004). New tenures have been balanced by retirements, resignations, and a new tenure-track line in geography. The percent of the faculty holding tenure will probably rise during the next few years, but that number will have no impact on the requirements for a positive tenure recommendation. Excepting University-wide financial problems, there are no external impediments to tenure in this Department.

### 2.1.3 - THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

The Probationary Period, especially the first two to three years, is among the most demanding employment situations imaginable. The job requires that a new faculty member must simultaneously: 1) teach a variety of courses for the first time; 2) establish himself/herself as a valued and trusted colleague; and 3) organize and execute a plan for professional growth and development. Many new faculty members have little idea about how to succeed in the world they have just entered. The endless stream of deadlines, new responsibilities, different environment, new administrative structure, apparently mixed messages, and gossip are sufficient to challenge almost everyone.

Fortunately, several excellent sources of information and advice are available at Georgia Southern University, a few of which are listed below.

#### *University-Sponsored New Faculty Orientation*

During their first week on campus, new faculty are required to attend a day-long orientation session. The orientation provides the incoming faculty member with information on university procedures, administration, resources, funding opportunities, and expectations. The session also offers opportunities to establish working relationships with senior administrative personnel as well as faculty in other disciplines and colleges. In addition, new faculty are strongly encouraged to attend a seven-week program of two-hour meetings that focus on issues and skills of critical importance during the probationary period. The topics to be addressed include legal issues related to copyright and fair use, developing an effective syllabus, promotion and tenure procedures, and developing a faculty portfolio.

#### *Teacher-Scholar Development Seminars for New Faculty*

Sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs, these Monday afternoon meetings are the University's official faculty orientation program.

#### *College of Science and Technology New Faculty Workshop*

The College of Science and Technology annually hosts a workshop for new faculty on Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.

#### *Center for Excellence in Teaching (CET)*

The CET is an excellent resource for all Georgia Southern faculty members, but is particularly useful for those just beginning their career. The focus of the Center is enhancing teaching and learning by enlarging and enhancing the faculty's instructional skills. The CET provides training sessions on a variety of computer software and hardware. Some hardware (e.g., digital cameras) can be borrowed from the CET. Most importantly, the Center provides a venue for learning new instructional techniques and discussing the practice of teaching.

#### *Faculty Mentor*

The Faculty Mentor Program is organized through the Center for Excellence in Teaching. New faculty members may choose a mentor from outside their department to help guide them through the first year of their career.

*Colleagues and Department Chair*

The best sources of information about how to succeed in the Department of Geology and Geography are faculty colleagues. With a commitment to the success of every member of the Department, the faculty will share their experience and expertise freely. The senior faculty have perspective and experience. The junior faculty have an intimate understanding of the process as it currently works. The Department Chair is the best source of information about policies and can usually resolve any conflicts in information.

*Tomorrow's Professor List Server*

*Tomorrow's Professor* List Server is a shared mission partnership of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE at <http://www.aahe.org/>) and The National Teaching and Learning Forum (NT&LF at <http://www.ntlf.com/>) and is operated by the Stanford University Learning Laboratory. Anyone may SUBSCRIBE to Tomorrows-Professor Listserv by sending the following e-mail message to: <Majordomo@lists.stanford.edu>

subscribe tomorrows-professor

A hundred times a year, the server distributes abridged articles from a wide range of sources. This source of information on the life of an academic is strongly recommended.

During the Probationary Period, faculty employment is based on one-year contracts. The decision to renew the employment contract is made annually. Contract renewal and reappointment requires satisfactory progress toward tenure. Quality performance in teaching, research, and service is the standard for demonstrating progress. A decision not to renew the contract terminates employment. See Section 2.2.5 - Procedures for the Retention of Probationary Faculty for a description of the Department's reappointment process.

## 2.1.4 - THE THREE CRITERIA

*It's not hard to make decisions when you know what your values are.  
--Roy Disney*

### Introduction

Every faculty personnel decision, including the initial hire, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, is based on a qualitative assessment of the individual faculty member's accomplishments in three areas: 1) teaching, 2) scholarship (including professional growth and development), and 3) service through discipline-related activities (which includes institutional service, activities with the community, and service to the profession). See §205.01 of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook for a more complete description of the activities included under each of these evaluation criteria.

### Distribution of Effort

As part of the Annual Review, each faculty member must reach agreement with the Department Chair about the percentage of their total time that will be devoted to each of the three areas. During the initial appointment, unless other agreements have been reached, all new faculty will be considered to have their loads distributed as described for probationary faculty.

#### *Probationary Faculty*

Probationary faculty generally have a smaller range of possibilities for the division of their efforts available to them because they must establish themselves in all three areas. With few exceptions, probationary faculty will have their loads distributed within the ranges indicated below, with most people having the standard distribution shown in parentheses. Any significant deviation from these numbers requires a detailed explanation of the rationale and full approval by the Department Chair.

Teaching	65-75% (70%)
Scholarship	10-20% (20%)
Service	10-20% (10%)

#### *Tenured Faculty*

Tenured faculty may, with the consent of the Department Chair, distribute their efforts over a broader range of possibilities than probationary faculty. No less than 5% of effort may assigned to either scholarship or service and not more than 90% assigned to teaching, except under extraordinary circumstances. Therefore, the standard load remains the same as for probationary faculty, but the available ranges for the division of effort are:

Teaching	50-90% (70%)
Scholarship	5-45% (20%)
Service	5-45% (10%)

## Definitions of Load Distribution

In order to have value, the meaning of the “standard” distribution of load must be defined. For the 2002-2003 academic year, the Office of Academic Affairs has created a special task force to investigate to study the faculty’s responsibilities and rewards. The report of this task force may help establish University policy on these issues. Although not part of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, a memo from the Provost’s Office dated July 6, 1998, spelled out workload parameters for the semester system, which was new to the University System of Georgia in Fall 1998. At Georgia Southern University, the “full load” for a regular full-time faculty member was set at the equivalent of 15 semester hours of teaching. Most faculty were expected to be assigned 12 semester hours of instruction, with the other 3 hours given over to other duties in service and research. Because no formal University policy currently exists, the Department has chosen to set the following standards.

### *Teaching*

The standard teaching load of 12-contact hours per semester is equated to the value of 70% “normally” assigned to teaching. (A “contact hour” is defined as assigned time in the class room. Therefore, for example, a one credit-hour laboratory that meets for two hours each week has an associated teaching responsibility of two contact hours.) The actual number of contact hours taught may vary slightly from semester to semester, but the expectation is that the average over a two-year period will be 12-hours per semester.

Faculty who choose to have more than 75% of their efforts assigned to teaching will teach more than the standard 12 contact-hours per semester. Similarly, larger percentage assignments in the areas of service and scholarship will raise the expectations for satisfactory productivity in those areas above the norms given previously. Reduction of the teaching assignment below 60% will occur only when there is a formal *written* reassignment of duties. Such reassignments are almost always made in consultation with the Dean of the College of Science and Technology.

### *Service*

A service load of 10% is equated to two “significant” service responsibilities within the Department, or their equivalent at the College and/or University levels, and other “minor” service activities. The University (§205.01) considers academic advising as a form of service. All members of the Department’s faculty are expected to advise majors in their discipline as part of their service responsibility.

### *Research*

With a “standard” 20% assigned to scholarship, a faculty member is expected to maintain continuous productivity. Being “continuously productive” means that some product will, on average, be completed annually. This will often be a paper for a national meeting. Every 2-3 years, the “continuously productive scholar” will produce something of greater scope, e.g., a peer-reviewed paper or book chapter, a grant proposal for funding from external sources, or a prestigious award from a professional or governmental organization.

## The Department’s Standards

Quality achievement is the standard for performance to obtain positive recommendations for merit salary increases, retention, tenure, and promotion. Demonstrating the quality of the achievement is the sole responsibility of the individual faculty member. The standards for satisfactory performance expected of faculty in the three areas are:

*Teaching* – Faculty must be competent (up to date in their disciplines), creative (continuously involved in improving their teaching), and concerned (understanding and fair).

*Service* – Faculty must be actively involved and make meaningful contributions.

*Research* – Faculty must maintain continuous productivity.

These statements reflect a more general standard that faculty should engage, grow, and mature in their teaching, service, and research. A positive recommendation for tenure cannot be expected unless probationary faculty attain these standards. Promotions are recognition that the individual is already routinely functioning at the level appropriate to the rank, producing consistently high quality instruction, service with tangible positive impacts on the community, and research meeting the standards for the discipline.

## 2.1.5 - TEACHING

*The mediocre teacher tells.  
The good teacher explains.  
The superior teacher demonstrates.  
The great teacher inspires.  
-- William Arthur Ward*

### Introduction

Teaching is the most important responsibility of the Georgia Southern University faculty. *For the probationary faculty member, becoming a good teacher and making the case for the quality of her/his work is the key to continued employment at the University.* The University's faculty are also expected to be active scholars and to make contributions to the University and the larger community, but teaching always comes first. Because scholarship and service are part of the faculty's responsibilities, tenure or promotion cannot be earned on the basis of teaching alone, but they also would not be granted *unless* the case for quality teaching can be made.

Evaluating the quality of instruction is among the most vexing chores in higher education. Paper after paper and book upon book have been written on the topic. One of the few ideas that finds nearly universal acceptance is the notion that learning is the expected outcome of teaching. Ideally, teaching should be evaluated in terms of its success at promoting learning. If we only knew how to do that, the complexity and uncertainty involved in the evaluation of teaching could be eliminated and the entire process could be reduced to a single number, something like a blood pressure that characterizes your current state of being. Recognizing the complexity of the teaching/learning process, the faculty in this department do not believe that teaching success can be characterized simplistically.

If learning truly is the desirable outcome of teaching then a more complete understanding of learning may lead to a better understanding of successful teaching. Learning can be conceptualized in at least the following six ways (Marton et al., 1993):

1. Increasing one's knowledge.
2. Learning as memorizing and reproducing.
3. Learning as applying.
4. Learning as understanding.
5. Learning as seeing something in a different way.
6. Learning as changing as a person.

Successful teaching probably produces all of these changes, although certainly not in equal degree or at the same time. Evaluation of teaching, whether done by the individual under review, by students, or by colleagues, should focus on these outcomes.

### Sources of Evaluative Information

*"Assessment is better viewed as an argument than a scientific study."  
—Braskamp and Ory*

#### *Self Evaluation*

Self evaluation is sometimes overlooked as perhaps the single most important source of information for faculty assessment. Ideally, the faculty member has a well conceived, coherent,

and appropriate rationale for the organization, content, and style of each course. See Section 2.1.8 for suggestions for producing self evaluations.

### *Student Evaluations*

Student Evaluations of Instruction were originally conceived as a means of gathering information to improve the quality of teaching. When this was their only purpose, evaluations were often conducted by the faculty member and were considered to be the property of the individual. Student evaluations became institutionalized in response to calls for accountability and assessment.

Georgia Southern University requires the evaluation of every course (except 1-hour courses), every Fall and Spring semester (Summer term course evaluations are optional) and the information is the property of the institution and therefore, the State of Georgia. As such, it is a matter of public record. Anyone can request copies of the summary data. The Department uses Georgia Southern's standard student evaluation form and currently does not add any additional questions. A copy of this form is included in Appendix 2.1. The Department expects probationary (untenured) faculty to have student evaluations conducted in all their courses, including 1 credit-hour laboratories and courses taught during summer school.

What student evaluations of instruction actually measure is the topic of a vast literature. Some studies have shown a strong direct correlation between the grade a student anticipates in a course and the evaluation of the instructor; while other results have shown the relationship to be minimal (Braskamp and Ory, 1994, p. 100). Without doubt, truly exceptional teachers generally receive excellent evaluations and incompetent instruction is nearly impossible to disguise. Considered *en masse*, a large number of student evaluations from a variety of courses will usually highlight both the professor's strengths and weaknesses in the classroom. Individual evaluations cannot be trusted to do either. Few professors will be fortunate enough to escape the ire of at least a few unhappy students. These jolts to the ego are usually counterbalanced by comments from the students who find us the most fascinating people in the world. Neither gives a fair picture of the norm.

Student evaluations of instruction do offer an important and unique perspective on instruction and, when taken as a whole, provide a general notion of an instructor's teaching skills. In particular, student evaluations provide insight into: 1) Course organization; 2) Classroom communication skills; 3) Class preparation; 4) Relative work load compared to other courses; and 5) Ease or formality with which the professor relates to students. What students know the most about is the instructional environment.

Student evaluations are regarded seriously as one source of information about instruction. The Department Chair will read every student comment on evaluations of probationary faculty and selected examples from evaluations of tenured faculty. A summary of the numerical data for the previous calendar year should be part of every faculty member's Annual Review. The Department has created an Excel spreadsheet that can be used to give the summary average (weighted by the number of respondents) for questions 8 through 18. The first seven questions are not included because they concern the individual student and not an evaluation of the course or the instructor. The spreadsheet also calculates the weighted average for each question for each semester. These data will be part of the discussion of teaching that occurs during every Annual Review feedback session with the Department Chair. Furthermore, the Office of Academic Affairs at Georgia Southern University requires that a 3-year summary of student evaluations' numerical data (questions 8 through 18) be submitted as part of a tenure or promotion package. Each faculty member is responsible for maintaining these data in the form required by the Provost.

### *Peer Evaluations*

Peer evaluation is another important source of information about the quality of instruction, just as it provides the most meaningful evaluation of scholarship. Feedback from peers may be informal, such as a complimentary note on a well presented seminar, or it may be result of a formally structured process. Peer evaluations may come from members of the home department, from colleagues within the university, or from faculty from other institutions. Each provides a valuable perspective on style and substance.

While students are valued sources of information about the learning environment, peer faculty members are in the best position to evaluate the practice and scholarship of teaching. Braskamp and Ory (1964, p. 97-98) produced the following list as examples of the topics peer faculty are uniquely qualified to judge:

- Knowledge and expertise in the major field as reflected by the course syllabus and reading list.
- Selection of course objectives.
- Selection of instructional materials.
- Assignments, group projects, and examinations.
- Success in students' achievement, as indicated by their performance on exams and projects.
- Research supervision.
- Involvement in the scholarship of teaching.
- Style as an instructor.

This list is not intended to be prescriptive and it is highly unlikely that any single evaluation would touch on all these subjects. Rather than providing an outline for a peer review of teaching, the list suggests the range of activities that faculty engage in as part of their instructional responsibility. Although far too often overlooked today, the original goal of course reviews was the improvement of instruction, not the evaluation of faculty. Peer reviews often focus on the more important objective while providing informed judgments of individual accomplishments.

In addition to the recommendations of the Provost and the Dean of College of Science and Technology, the Department of Geology and Geography strongly encourages peer evaluation of instruction. Having diverse evaluations of teaching from a variety of sources makes the strongest case for effective teaching. The Center for Excellence in Teaching provides several means of obtaining peer evaluations. Informal feedback usually results from the individual faculty member's initiative. In addition, the Department of Geology and Geography has a process for obtaining peer evaluations from Departmental colleagues. The Department's formal peer evaluation process is described in Section 2.2.3 of this Handbook. Evaluations will be provided of classroom presentations and relevant course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, examinations) provided by the instructor to establish the context for class visitations.

Peer evaluation of classroom instruction is *not* required by the University's personnel policies, by the College of Science and Technology, nor by the Department. Such evaluations, whether formal or informal, are purely voluntary, as is their use in preparing a dossier for personnel action. However, the Department has placed formal peer evaluation at the top of the list of evidence of teaching effectiveness (see page 63). Making a case for quality teaching without formal peer evaluation would, therefore, be difficult.

The individual under review is solely responsible for making the case for the quality of instruction. That case can be made in a variety of ways. Peer evaluation provides an important

source of information (in addition to the required student course evaluations) that can be used as evidence of quality instruction. More importantly, faculty peers have experience in a wide variety of teaching styles and techniques. Colleagues are happy to share their knowledge and able to make suggestions that often lead to improvements in teaching.

## 2.1.6 - SCHOLARSHIP

*“Scholarship is not an esoteric appendage; it is at the heart of what the profession is all about . . . to weaken faculty commitment to scholarship . . . is to undermine the undergraduate experience, regardless of the academic setting.”*  
-- Ernest L. Boyer

### General Statement on Professional Activity

Expectations of scholarship vary greatly among the different categories of institutions of higher education recognized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Doctoral/Research Universities commonly place the greatest emphasis on scholarship, generally requiring substantial records of publication and successful grant applications before continuous employment (tenure) is offered. At the other extreme, Associate Colleges (two-year colleges) evaluate and reward faculty based almost entirely upon their teaching. Baccalaureate Colleges and Master’s Colleges and Universities (the group in which Georgia Southern is now classified) fall in between these extremes in their expectations of scholarship. Colleges and universities belonging to both categories commonly place greater emphasis on teaching than scholarship, but do expect faculty to be professionally active. In general, the more highly regarded these institutions are, the greater the emphasis placed on scholarship as a criterion for faculty rewards.

The role of scholarship in American higher education has gone through three overlapping, although distinct, phases according to Boyer (1990), the source for the following discussion. The “colonial college” was rooted in the British system with its emphasis on learning and the student. The earliest colonial colleges had as their goals the production of clergy and a general improvement in the moral fabric of the gentry. In this setting, “Teaching was viewed as a vocation—a sacred calling—an act of dedication honored as fully as the ministry” (Boyer, 1990, p. 4). The core of this tradition was still alive well into the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

By the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, both private and public universities found much of their energy applied to educational programs in the “service” of people and the nation. Applied and professional colleges began to emerge across the country as more and more universities were created with the aid of the Federal Land Grant College Act of 1862. For the first time, American higher education accepted the “non-elite young people” of the nation in large numbers. “Applied” research grew along side “pure” or “basic” research, which did not have a strong tradition growing out of the colonial colleges. Institutions dedicated to research were the exceptions, as most of American higher education continued to emphasize undergraduate education, especially in the rapidly growing schools of agriculture, education, and engineering and mechanical arts.

By World War II the cadre of American scholars, especially in the sciences, had grown large enough that it played a vital part in the victorious strategy. The unprecedented access to higher education in the post-war years produced a host of new PhDs who filled the rapidly expanding campuses nationwide. As “they sought to replicate the research climate they themselves had recently experienced . . . academic priorities that had for years been the inspiration of the few now became the imperative of the many” (Boyer, 1990, p. 10). Although “young faculty were hired as *teachers*, they were evaluated primarily as *researchers*.” At what were then termed “comprehensive universities,” such as Georgia Southern, the change was rapid and profound. In the 20-year period between 1969 and 1989, the percent of faculty who responded “Strongly agree” to the statement, “In my department it is difficult for a person to achieve tenure if he or she does not publish,” increased from 6% to 43%. During the 50 years following the start of World War II, “at many of the nation’s four-year institutions, the focus had moved from

the student to the professoriate, from general to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession” (Boyer, 1990, p. 13).

The evolution of faculty roles is reflected in these stages. Teaching was the sole responsibility of faculty in the colonial period. Service was added as applied knowledge entered the academy. The emphasis on research for all faculty is a recent change at institutions such as Georgia Southern.

### **The Importance of Professional Activity**

Professional activity has become an important part of a successful academic career because of the numerous roles that faculty are required to fill. In fact, professional activity has strong links to disciplinary competence, intellectual vigor, personal accomplishment, the University’s status among its peers, and financial rewards for both the individual and the institution. Although the following list is incomplete, it touches on some of the specific outcomes of professional activity.

- Maintain understanding of rapidly evolving specialties.
- Maintain intellectual vitality.
- Retain contact with peer review system.
- Provide research opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students.
- Contribute to the general store of knowledge and the profession.
- Apply knowledge to societal welfare at the local, regional, and national levels.
- Bring recognition and prestige to the individual, department, and institution.
- Produce revenue for the institution through indirect costs included in externally funded projects.

### **Types of Scholarship**

Over the last 15 years, most colleges and universities have come to accept the notion that several types of scholarship are acceptable for professional growth and development. Perhaps the most important work on this topic is Ernest L. Boyer’s *Scholarship Considered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Jossey-Bass, 1990). The follow-up work, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* by C.E. Glassick, M.T. Huber, and G.I. Maeroff (Jossey-Bass, 1997), extends Boyer’s ideas and “proposes new standards for assessing scholarship and evaluating faculty with special emphasis on methods of documenting effective scholarship.” Both books are available in the Department’s Faculty Work Room. The four types of scholarship described by Boyer are described briefly below.

#### **The Scholarship of Discovery:** *The pursuit of original knowledge and creativity.*

For geologists and geographers the scholarship of discovery is traditional research. Evidence of achievement includes: publication of original contributions to knowledge in refereed journals or books, refereed conference papers, presentations at meetings of learned societies, and grant proposals to sources of funding outside the university. Preparing and submitting papers and grants is important evidence of scholarship, even if they are not immediately accepted. Publication in prestigious journals, funding of large research grants, and significant awards from learned societies constitute the strongest evidence of peer approval and respect for this kind of work.

**The Scholarship of Teaching:** *Activities with intellectual merit that contribute to teaching and learning, or to the understanding of teaching and learning.*

These activities include creating original instructional materials, developing original curricula, incorporating new knowledge or new technology into existing courses, evaluating the effectiveness of pedagogical procedures, and examining ethical and/or societal issues in the course context in an original manner. The distinguishing difference between a faculty member's instructional responsibilities and scholarship devoted to teaching is that the products of scholarship are shared with and reviewed by peers outside of Georgia Southern University. The "Scholarship of Teaching" should result in publications in journals of pedagogy, presentations at meetings of scientific and pedagogical organizations, and/or proposals for funding of projects by agencies external to the University.

**The Scholarship of Integration:** *Original contributions that make connections between disciplines, create new contexts for viewing knowledge, or establish new models.*

Integrative scholarship goes well beyond simply collecting or cataloging information and knowledge from various disciplines. Contributions must reflect original insight, put apparently unrelated facts into perspective, or place specialized knowledge into a larger context. The products of the "Scholarship of Integration" are shared with large audiences, usually exceeding the boundaries of the discipline (or the sciences for that matter) in scope. Providing a greater understanding of the nature and importance of geology and geography to general audiences is appropriate to this scholarship. The works of Carl Sagan and Stephen J. Gould (e.g., *Wonderful Life*) are outstanding examples of integrative scholarship.

**The Scholarship of Application:** *The application of knowledge that occurs when scholars apply their expertise responsibly to consequential problems for the general good.*

The Scholarship of Application is not service. Boyer draws a clear distinction "between *citizenship* activities and projects that relate to scholarship itself." Service activities may become scholarship when they are directly linked to one's field of professional specialization. "Such service is serious, demanding work, requiring the rigor—and accountability—traditionally associated with research activities" (Boyer, 1990, p. 22).

In describing their accomplishments, faculty members should be explicit about the focus of their scholarship and which of these areas most closely describes their work. As a faculty member's length of service increases, contributions through more than one area of scholarship become common. Probationary faculty should, however, be constrained in the focus so that a record of accomplishment and growth can be established.

All faculty, both tenured and probationary, should discuss any major change in scholarly emphasis with the Department Chair. Such changes often result in periods of diminished productivity until the new work has matured and produced results that can be shared. The Department Chair can advise on the potential impact of such changes.

## Scholarship in Geology and Geography

Among the questions that must be answered is what products and activities qualify as scholarship. An exhaustive list is impossible, although the traditional expressions of scholarship are widely understood. A number of the ideas that follow are informed by Arnold (2002).

As a Department, we have agreed that all forms of scholarship share some common qualities. Those qualities are (after Diamond and Adam, 2000):

1. The activity requires a high level of discipline-related expertise.
2. The activity breaks new ground or is innovative.
3. The activity can be replicated or elaborated.
4. The work and its results can be documented.
5. The work and its results can be peer reviewed.
6. The activity is valued by peers.

With these criteria individuals should be able to judge whether or not a particular activity or product qualifies as scholarship. If one of these qualities is missing, the activity may still be an acceptable form of professional activity. For example, an activity may not be especially ground breaking or innovative, but it still constitutes quality professional work. On the other hand, any activity that lacks two or more of these qualities is highly unlikely to qualify as appropriate scholarship (although it may be excellent service).

If an activity or product meets all these tests (and it is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that it does), then it will be considered as scholarship appropriate to the discipline. This qualification in kind does not imply anything about the quality or merit of the product or activity.

The Association of American Geographers has published a position paper titled "Reconsidering Faculty Roles and Rewards in Geography," which geography faculty are encouraged to consult (AAG Special Committee). No equivalent statement has been produced for geology.

## The Goal

In building a record of professional growth and development, the objective is not to produce a certain number of publications during the probationary period. The real goal is to make a convincing case that the individual understands the nature of scholarship in the discipline and has the demonstrated capacity and desire to pursue a life-long career as a contributing member of the profession. Probationary faculty members need to prove they are competent professionals in their discipline, capable of producing original contributions, and that they will continue to do so throughout their careers, *not because it is required but because it is important to them personally*.

The probationary period for faculty without prior teaching experience is expected to be six years long because significant accomplishments are required in teaching, service, and scholarship. The steps necessary to reach the goal outlined above cannot be taken all at once, but the first step (see below) should be taken immediately. Those who achieve tenure with no concerns having been expressed about their scholarship will generally have accomplished the following:

1. Produced a plan for research and scholarly activities soon after arriving at Georgia Southern University and updated it every year.
2. Published everything they could from their PhD research.
3. Done sufficient new work and produced sufficient scholarly products to establish that they can conduct publishable research on their own, without the assistance of an immediate research advisor.
4. Made the strongest possible case for the quality and significance of their work based on a variety of data from as many sources as are available.
5. Demonstrated that they have a well conceived research agenda for the future and the enthusiasm to pursue it.

## **The Plan for Research and Scholarly Activities**

*It's not the plan that is important, it's the planning. - Graeme Edwards*

Ideally, scholarship is not an external requirement imposed upon an individual. Rather, for geographers and geologists scholarship is one result of a life-long interest in their subject and an insatiable curiosity about the Earth and its inhabitants. Professional activities are best understood in terms of a professional plan, and that plan is best conveyed in narrative form. The plan should be as formal and as complete as possible. The plan should integrate and connect activities. The plan can always change, sometimes dramatically in response to new opportunities. The critical elements of the plan include:

- 1) The plan must follow from the individual's scholarly expertise.
- 2) The plan must be coherent.
- 3) The plan must be reasonable in terms of other faculty responsibilities and the resources available to support the work.
- 4) The plan must produce peer reviewed and widely distributed results.
- 5) The plan must be updated regularly.

New faculty should produce a written research plan by the end of their first year at Georgia Southern University. The plan should be kept up to date, reflecting accomplishments and current thinking. The plan should be shared with colleagues, including the Chair, for feedback, suggestions (often very helpful), and commentary. Because the responsibility for making the case for tenure and promotion resides solely with the individual under consideration, sharing the plan with colleagues is an excellent way to begin educating them about your scholarly interests.

## **Qualitative Evaluation of Scholarship**

Qualitative evaluations of scholarship begin with self evaluation, which sets the stage for Department and external reviews. In scholarship, as in teaching and service, the individual under review is responsible for making his or her case in the form of a coherent narrative that explains: 1) what was done; 2) why it was done; 3) why it is important, and, 4) what comes next. See Section 2.1.8 for additional discussion of the narrative.

A variety of evidence can be used to evaluate the quality of scholarship. Braskamp and Ory (1994, p. 86) suggest the following as "Types of Evidence for Describing and Judging Research and Creative Activity." This list, although extensive, is not complete and is not meant to be prescriptive.

*Descriptions of Research and Creative Activity*

- Summary of responsibilities and activities
- Analyses of research and creative problems addressed
- Sample of work
- Participation in improvement activities

*Outcomes*

- Publication in journals
- Papers presented at professional meetings
- Books (sole, multiple author)
- Edited books (sole, multiple author)
- Chapters in books
- Monographs
- Grants and external funding
- Other publications
- Unpublished papers and reports
- Grant proposals generated for funding outside the University

*Judgments About Research and Creative Activity*

- Evaluation from faculty colleagues at local and other institutions
- Evaluation from departmental chair, deans, and other administrative officers
- Evaluation from experts (curators, critics)

*Eminence Measures*

- Referee or editor of journal
- Honors and awards from profession
- Officer of national professional association
- Invited papers and guest lectures
- Invited exhibitions and performances
- Citation rate of published work

*Self-Reflection and Appraisal*

- Professional journals and logs
- Public self appraisals (including updates to the professional plan)

**Quantity and Quality**

How many publications does it take to get tenure? The only certain answer to this question is that it is a non-zero number. In disciplines that are not performance based (e.g., music, art, drama), it is almost inconceivable that a faculty member could earn tenure at Georgia Southern University without at least one peer-reviewed publication. Beyond this, definitive answers about numbers of publications become difficult. One truly revolutionary publication (e.g., a new theory of planetary evolution) would almost certainly be sufficient to meet the research requirements for tenure (especially if it brought recognition and resources to the University). Two publications in reputable journals during each of the six probationary years would certainly be sufficient to make the case. So, if two publications a year is more than enough, would one publication a year (a total of six) be sufficient? Probably. Would five?

Four? Three? Maybe. Maybe not. The only certainty is that quality always matters more than quantity. The individual is responsible for explaining the significance and impact of the work.

### **Student Involvement in Research and Scholarly Activities**

Faculty are encouraged to involve students in their research and scholarly activities when appropriate. The mentor relationship with student research assistants may cement their interest in geography or geology, provide first-hand experience with a variety of analytical techniques, and result in an experience that may become their senior thesis research.

### **Scholarly Misconduct**

The University System of Georgia and Georgia Southern University have carefully defined legal definitions and procedures for recognizing and responding to scholarly misconduct. See §210.02 and §404 of the University's Faculty Handbook for specific information.

## 2.1.7 – SERVICE

*Ability will never catch up with the demand for it. -- Malcolm S. Forbes*

### Introduction

Service takes numerous forms, but all are based upon the ideal that faculty should play active roles in the various communities where they work and live. Because colleges and universities see themselves as communities of scholars, faculty are vital to the governance and operations of their Departments, Colleges, and Universities. Because faculty are skilled professionals, their disciplinary knowledge can and should be used to benefit their professions and the people of their community. For the purposes of faculty evaluation at Georgia Southern University, service activities must be discipline-based (§205.01).

During the probationary period, faculty should focus their service activities on the Department. One of the first goals for newly appointed faculty is to establish themselves among their peers as good and reliable colleagues. Service activities provide visibility, the opportunity to interact with colleagues, and the chance to learn institutional processes first hand. Tenured faculty begin to assume leadership roles, first in the Department and then in the University. Elected positions in faculty governance provide the larger view of the University's organization and operations. With additional experience, faculty may be asked first to serve on, and later to lead, various committees and task forces of University-wide impact.

Although most service activities will require only one line on the CV or annual review, the Department recognizes the qualitative differences that exist. Most important, the greater the amount of responsibility the greater the credit given for service activities. Committee chairs, laboratory directors and supervisors, and many other jobs must be done thoroughly and punctually for the Department to function and meet its obligations.

### Types of Service

#### *Service to the Department*

The Department cannot accomplish all that is necessary unless everyone participates. More immediately than most other types of activities, the members of the Department are truly served by their colleagues' efforts.

Departmental service usually takes the form of committee work or individual assignments to special tasks. Section 1.7 provides a list and description of the Department's permanent and *ad hoc* committees and other faculty assignments.

Among the most valuable service activities for the Department is academic advising of geology and geography majors. By the end of their second year on the faculty, tenure-track professors are expected to participate in academic advising.

#### *Service to the University*

University service commonly involves work on special committees and task forces, involvement in shared governance of the institution, and a variety of outreach activities for the wider community (including curatorship of Georgia Southern Museum exhibits).

### *Service to the Community*

Community service includes *discipline-based* participation in political, civic, service, youth, public interest, and religious organizations.

### *Service to the Profession*

Service to the profession entails diverse activities that include service on committees, holding office, reviewing grant proposals, peer review of manuscripts, and organizing professional meetings. Service on accreditation bodies and national examining boards is an example of service to the profession of higher education.

## **Documenting Service**

The following types of evidence can be used to describe and judge service (adapted from Braskamp and Ory, 1994, p. 89):

### *Descriptions of Service Activities*

- Leadership responsibilities
- Active participation in committee work
- Timely completion of assignments
- Degree of involvement in professional organizations
- Degree of discipline-based participation in civic organizations
- Attendance and support of Departmental, College, and University activities
- Documentation through minutes, reports, and other evidence of active participation and contribution.

### *Outcomes*

- Successful completion of assignments (e.g., search committees, newsletter)
- Changes in policies of campus or professional organizations (e.g., curricular)

### *Judgments About Service*

- Ratings of effectiveness by faculty colleagues and administration
- Colleague review and evaluation by committee members and Department Chair
- Evaluation of participation in community groups, professional organizations, and public office by knowledgeable associates

### *Eminence Measures*

- Reelection or reappointment to leadership positions
- Reappointment or reelection to public office

## 2.1.8 - DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY DOSSIERS

*Don't tell me how hard you work. Tell me how much you get done. --James Ling*

### Introduction

Although there is no prescriptive format for faculty dossiers, there are Departmental recommendations for an effective pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure document. In general, the dossier should contain a narrative supported by evidence, a current CV, and appendices that may include course materials, summaries of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and letters from colleagues and external reviewers. The entire dossier should fit in a single three-ring binder. Non-traditional materials such as video tapes or compact disks may require additional space.

Sample documents are usually available from the Department Chair. Faculty are encouraged to consult with their colleagues, who are almost always willing to loan their materials and/or review a submission for content and organization.

### Content and Organization

#### *Letter of Submittal*

The first page of the document should be a letter of submittal. The letter will state the personnel action for which the document is being submitted and may contain a description of the document's organization. The letter should be dated and signed.

#### *The Narrative*

In this section, the faculty member should explain his or her philosophy regarding teaching, scholarship, and service, supported by evidence and documentation included in appendices. Because the narrative is sent to external reviewers, it should stand on its own, providing a complete self evaluation of professional activities relevant to the personnel action under consideration. Organization and clarity of presentation are essential. Faculty members are expected to make their own cases by providing their colleagues and administrators with a thorough understanding of their activities and accomplishments.

Excellent suggestions for how to construct and organize the self evaluation are found in Braskamp and Ory (1994, p. 112). These suggestions apply equally to teaching, scholarship, and service, and, at their best, supply a framework for integration of a faculty member's diverse responsibilities.

- "Use the reflective essay as a means to display the thinking behind the work." A well written narrative always tells the story better than tables of data.
- "Link contributions to institutional expectations." Discuss how personal goals correspond to Departmental, College, and University goals.
- "Keep quality at the forefront of the self-appraisal." Discuss judgements of personal contributions from all relevant sources of information.

- “Use evidence to back up generalizations about quality.” For example, if the product is a book for general audiences include reviews from highly regarded sources. Include sales figures, awards, citations in other works. Apply the same kind of reasoning to other contributions.
- “Make a case by integrating the various forms of work and indicating how each reinforces the other . . .” Ideally there should be an evolution toward coherence among the goals for teaching, research, and service.
- “The judgements of all clients and customers—that is, faculty colleagues, students, professionals, and citizens—should be included in a portrayal.” Fellow faculty members (both junior and senior), professional colleagues, and students each have a unique perspective that adds to the complete depiction of faculty work.
- “Select certain times to develop special portrayals.” The case one makes for tenure should reflect that stage in an academic’s career and should be fundamentally different from the case made years later when promotion to full professor is the goal.

### *Curriculum Vitae*

Immediately following the narrative is a current *curriculum vitae*. A complete professional employment history, identification and dates of all degrees earned, and public service information should be included. Peer-reviewed work should be clearly identified as should work completed since the last promotion or since appointment at Georgia Southern University. Works in press may be listed if accompanied by a letter from the journal or publisher; submitted works or works in progress may be listed separately. Once materials are submitted, only the dean may alter the packet at the request of the faculty member, based on verified significant accomplishments or other information which became available after the packet was submitted, following consultation with the department chair.

### *Appendices*

Detailed information should be appended to the other materials. Course materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, assignments), student evaluations, letters from colleagues and former students, book reviews, summaries of grade distributions, reprints of published work, editors’ letters of acceptance for manuscripts “in press,” copies of grant proposals (including reviewers comments), and external reviewer’s recommendations are examples of the type of material that should be included in the appendices.

### **External Review**

The Department requires reviews from external evaluators as part of applications for tenure and promotion. The Department strongly encourages colleagues to obtain external evaluations of their work as part of Post-Tenure Review. External reviews provide another form of evaluation that is often highly regarded because it is generally unbiased by personal association.

External reviewers must have scholarly expertise in the faculty member's field of research specialization. Reviewers should also have personal experience in a faculty role at an institution similar in size and mission to Georgia Southern.

The process of selecting external reviewers begins with a conversation between the faculty member undergoing review and the Department Chair. The faculty member should try to obtain the names of potential reviewers. The Chair may add names to the list. If the faculty member does not have suggestions, the Chair will produce a list of potential reviewers. The potential reviewers must be agreeable to both the Chair and the faculty member.

The Department Chair will contact at least three of the people on this list and ask them to provide a review of the applicant's qualifications. The material submitted to the outside reviewers will include (but is not limited to): 1) a complete CV, 2) the narrative portion of the application for tenure; and 3) copies of significant publications. The Chair will include the Department's "Criteria for Evaluation" (Section 2.2.2.) and "Procedures for Tenure Evaluation" (Section 2.2.6).

The reviewers' letters of evaluation will be submitted directly to the Chair who will add them to the candidate's dossier. The letters are not generally shared with the candidate. The Chair will remove the letters from the dossier before it is returned to the faculty member. They will become part of the individual's personnel file, maintained by the Department Chair.

### **Directions from the Office of Academic Affairs**

In addition to the University's Faculty Handbook, the Office of Academic Affairs provides specific guidance for the preparation of personnel dossiers. Because these guidelines change from year to year, faculty should consult the web site for the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at the following URL: <http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/>. Follow the links (Faculty / Personnel) to the latest information on Promotion and Tenure Processes. Pay particular attention to the specifications for reporting student evaluations of instruction and the content of the *curriculum vitae*.

## **2.1.9 – THE POST-TENURE PERIOD**

[This section is incomplete and requires additional work.]

*It's what you learn after you know it all that counts. --John Wooden*

### **Post-Tenure Review**

The award of tenure is an act of faith in an individual given by his or her colleagues and the University's administration. Tenured faculty are not only expected to maintain the level of competency and contributions they demonstrated at the time of tenure, but in fact to increase the number and level of their responsibilities. To assure their continued growth, tenured faculty are subject to Post-Tenure Review every 5 years. This 5-year period is counted from their last Post-Tenure Review, promotion, or return to full-time instruction from an administrative role.

Review is made by colleagues in the Department.

### **Goals of Post-Tenure Review**

- Recognize continued contributions through Merit Awards
- Ensure continued productivity
- Maintain quality and reputation of the program
- Provide a mechanism to recognize and remediate problems
- Provide a mechanism for the removal of unsatisfactory faculty.

### **Results of Post-Tenure Review**

*Meritorious Performance*

*Satisfactory Performance*

*Deficiencies Performance*

## 2.1.10 - PROMOTIONS

### Introduction

Faculty appointed to tenure-track positions are expected to have the training appropriate for a professional in the field. For geologists and geographers this is almost always the PhD. In addition to the degree, faculty members must have demonstrated creativity in the discipline and an interest in sharing their knowledge with students. Georgia Southern faculty members are expected to remain professionally active throughout their careers and to contribute to their institutional, local, and professional communities.

With experience and additional knowledge gained through their professional activities, faculty are expected to contribute more and to contribute at a higher level. Promotions are formal recognition of an individual's continued professional growth. Because the responsibilities of faculty increase with rank, promotions require that the faculty member already have demonstrated the ability to perform the responsibilities of the next highest rank.

### Criteria

In addition to the evaluating a faculty member's contributions in teaching, research, and service, time in rank is also a consideration in promotion decisions. Faculty must reach the level of achievement expected for the next higher rank *before* they are promoted. The University's Faculty Handbook (§208) states that a promotion is considered early if the person under evaluation has served fewer than the following number of years in rank at Georgia Southern before promotion to:

Assistant Professor	3 years
Associate Professor	4 years
Professor	5 years

The Handbook states that: "Early promotions are rare, requiring clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation." This statement acknowledges the fact that most people require some time to demonstrate and accumulate evidence that they are performing at the next level.

### Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor (and tenure, which usually comes at the same time) is recognition that the faculty member is performing at a level above that expected of Assistant Professors. In practical terms this means that the individual can establish a well documented case for the quality of their teaching, research, and service. The potential for accomplishment, to express the same idea in different terms, has been actualized by quality teaching, professional scholarship, and meaningful service and there are evaluations and products that attest to the achievements. When advanced to the rank of Associate Professor, the individual has demonstrated that they are ready to assume greater responsibility for the affairs of the Department, the University, and profession.

## **Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to Professor is the Department's and the University's expression of belief in an individual's willingness to continue professional growth throughout their tenure at Georgia Southern.

## 2.1.11 - PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

*Truth is not determined by majority vote. -- Doug Gwyn.*

### **Introduction**

With its relatively small size the Department of Geology and Geography has traditionally constituted its various personnel committees from the tenured faculty, without election or term of office. The Department's personnel committees are closest to the faculty and therefore, the first to review their materials and make recommendations on retention, pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion decisions. The Department Chair usually meets with the committees for the purpose of discussion. However, because each committee's recommendation is made to the Chair, he/she does not participate in formulating the committees' evaluations or recommendations.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

If a faculty member who would normally serve on a personnel committee feels that a conflict of interest may exist, she/he should discuss the issue with the Department Chair. In addition, any potential member of a personnel committee may be recused by another committee member or the Chair for a conflict of interest. If the Chair believes that the conflict of interest is substantial enough to cast doubt on a faculty member's ability to make an unbiased judgement, the faculty member may be relieved of the committee membership.

### **Types and Membership of Personnel Committees**

#### *Retention and Reappointment Committees*

Probationary faculty are employed on a year-to-year basis. The Department's tenured faculty serve as advisors to the Chair on reappointment of probationary faculty. When concerns are raised about reappointment, the tenured faculty will constitute themselves as a formal committee to consider retention and reappointment. The Department Chair will lead this committee.

#### *Pre-Tenure and Tenure Committees*

The Department's tenured faculty serve as the committee to review pre-tenure and tenure cases. After careful review of the dossier, the committee meets to discuss the case. By consensus or vote, the committee will reach a decision and make a formal written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation to the Department Chair.

#### *Committee for Promotion to Associate Professor*

A committee to review applications for promotion to associate professor consists of all the tenured members of the Department faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and Professor. By consensus or vote, the committee will reach a decision and make a formal written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation to the Department Chair.

*Committee for Promotion to Professor*

A committee to review applications for promotion to professor consists of all the tenured members of the Department faculty holding the rank of Professor. If fewer than 3 faculty members (excluding the chair) hold the required rank, faculty from other departments in the College holding the rank of Professor will be sought for the committee. By consensus or vote, the Committee will reach a decision and make a formal written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation to the Department Chair.

*Post-Tenure Review Committee*

The Department's committee to conduct post-tenure review of colleagues will consist of all tenured members of the faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor and Professor. By consensus or vote, the Committee makes a formal written evaluation of their colleague including characterizations of their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service as "Meritorious," "Satisfactory," or "Deficient."

## 2.1.12 - REFERENCES

AAG Special Committee on Faculty Roles and Rewards, 1994, *Reconsidering Faculty Roles and Rewards in Geography*: Association of American Geographers, 11 p.

Angelo, Thomas A., and Cross, K. Patricia, 1993, *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers [Second Edition]*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 427 p.

Arnold, J. David, 2002, Assessing a decade of *Scholarship Reconsidered*: The Teaching Professor, v. 16, no. 3, p. 1-2.

Boyer, E.L., 1990, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 147 p.

Braskamp, L.A., and Ory, J.C., 1994, *Assessing Faculty Work*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 333 p.

Diamond, R., and Adam, B., editors, 1995, *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*: Washington, D.C., American Association for Higher Education.

Glassick, C.E., Huber, M.T., and Maeroff, G.I., 1997, *Scholarship assessed: evaluation of the professoriate*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 130 p.

Lucas, A.F., and Associates, 2000, *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Department Chairs*: San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 310 p.

Marton, F., Dall'Alba, G., and Beaty, E., 1993, Conceptions of learning: *International Journal of Educational Research*, v. 19, p. 277-330.

## **2.2 - PERSONNEL PROCEDURES**

### **2.2.1 – GENERAL STATEMENT (See §205)**

#### **Process and Criteria**

The following procedures relate to the annual evaluation of faculty, the evaluation of probationary faculty members for retention, the evaluation of faculty members for tenure and promotions, and regular review of tenured faculty. The Department Chair is responsible for initiating the procedures in a timely manner to allow the faculty member(s) adequate time to prepare the necessary materials for Department, College, University, and Board of Regents deadlines. The Department Chair is also responsible for initiating the generation of peer evaluations from outside the University and providing a summary of the student evaluations to the faculty member(s) being evaluated and to those peers being asked for supporting evaluations. The Peer Evaluation of Teaching Coordinator organizes internal peer reviews of teaching following the procedure outlined in Section 2.2.3.

Faculty will be evaluated in each area of responsibility: teaching, scholarship, and service. Under normal circumstances (e.g., assignment to a full teaching load), teaching shall be weighted at a minimum of 65% of the faculty member's productivity and a maximum of 75%; the remaining 25-35% will be divided between scholarship and service with a minimum of 5% in each. Extenuating circumstances, such as reassignment of teaching responsibilities to research, or assignment to administrative duties, will be taken into consideration in all faculty evaluations. Such circumstances will be sufficient cause to: 1) reassign the divisions of effort as a temporary measure during the period in which the activity of administrative assignment is performed and/or; 2) approach the Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs and/or Board of Regents for special consideration for the faculty member(s) involved.

#### **Feedback (See §205.06C)**

Every personnel action, including annual reviews, produces evaluative information that becomes part of a faculty member's permanent record. In the Department of Geology and Geography, feedback is provided both orally and in writing. Copies of written evaluations are always given to the individual and any information from the Department's files will be provided upon request.

Evaluations may contain both praise and criticism. In either case, the information must be conveyed honestly and completely to the faculty member. No one likes criticism; not giving it, and certainly not receiving it. However, when areas of concern are identified, they must be discussed openly and honestly, always with the intent to promote improvement. Moreover, critical feedback, particularly in the first years of teaching, is important to understanding the Department's and the University's expectations.

Honest feedback also eliminates the worst result any personnel action can have — to totally surprise the person under review with a negative outcome. In providing feedback during each Annual Review, the Department Chair needs to clearly express his/her sense of the individual's accomplishments and progress toward the next major personnel action (i.e., tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review). Problem areas need to be carefully characterized in their severity. Minor problems often have quick and obvious solutions. Major problems may take years to address fully. No one is well served by understating the importance of a problem.

Every faculty member has the right to know, and the Department Chair has an obligation to explain, where they should focus their efforts and what is expected of them.

## 2.2.2 - CRITERIA USED FOR EVALUATION (See §205.01)

### Introduction

These criteria will be used as the basis for the evaluation of faculty members in the Department of Geology and Geography for merit salary increases (based on annual reviews), retention, tenure, promotions, and post-tenure review. In presenting the individual's case for any of these actions, the narrative portion of the dossier has the essential role of weaving all the activities into a picture that is coherent, compelling, and complete.

#### A. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness (in approximate order of relative importance)

1. Formal peer evaluations of instruction conducted by members of the Department's faculty and peer faculty from outside the Department such as those who serve through the Center for Excellence in Teaching.
2. Student evaluations on instruction provided through the University's established process.
3. Informal evaluations provided by faculty.
4. Supervision of student research.
5. Other sources documenting teaching effectiveness including: awards and other recognition of outstanding teaching from the College, the University, and professional organizations; developmental activities (short courses, workshops, innovative teaching methods, etc.); self evaluation; instructional materials used; course outlines, syllabi, tests, and other materials.

#### B. Evidence of Scholarship (in approximate order of relative importance)

1. Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, based upon original research, with special recognition given to invited papers.
2. Papers and posters presented at professional meetings.
3. Scholarly grant proposals generated, with greater weight given to those that are funded.
4. Discipline related publications for general audiences including introductory level textbooks, other monographs, and magazine articles.
5. Discipline related creative consulting (See Section 2.1.6, "Scholarship of Application.")
6. Professional honors and awards for scholarly activity.
7. Attendance at short courses and workshops.

#### C. Evidence of Discipline Related Service (not rank ordered)

##### *Department, College, and University Service*

1. Service activities within the Department. See list included in this Manual (Section 1.7).
2. Academic advising of geology and geography majors.
3. Committee service within the Department, the College of Science and Technology, Georgia Southern University (including faculty governance committees), or the University System of Georgia.
4. Elected positions in the faculty governance system (e.g., Faculty Senate, Strategic Planning Council).
5. Service as advisor for a student organization.
6. *Ad hoc* activities in support of the University (e.g., SOAR session, Admissions Open Houses, etc.).
7. Recruitment of students at the undergraduate and/or graduate level.

*Discipline Related Community Service*

1. Leadership roles (often as an elected officer).
2. Active participation in civic, youth, school, and charitable organizations.
3. Public relations (public presentations on geological or geographical topics).
4. Preparation of public exhibits, demonstrations, etc.
5. Judging of science fairs.

*Professional Service*

1. Offices in professional organizations.
2. Editorial positions with scholarly journals.
3. Peer review of scholarly writing and grant proposals.
4. Organization and supervision of professional meetings.
5. Organization and supervision of topical sessions at professional meetings.
6. Committee service.
7. Awards for service.

### **2.2.3 – PROCEDURES FOR PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

The Peer Evaluation of Teaching has the dual purpose of providing faculty with suggestions for improving their teaching and producing data that can be used as evidence of accomplishment in formal personnel procedures. Successive evaluations can provide evidence of improvement in teaching.

This procedure for the peer evaluation of teaching borrows heavily from the “Peer Review of Teaching Policy for the School of Technology, Georgia Southern University” document approved April 27, 2001.

1. Formal peer evaluations of teaching by the Department may be conducted for any member of the faculty. Individuals may request peer evaluations no more than twice per academic year.
2. Faculty who wish to have a formal peer evaluation of their teaching initiate the process by making a request in writing to the Peer Evaluation of Teaching Coordinator. The Coordinator is responsible for organizing all activities necessary for the review.
3. Peer evaluations will be conducted by a three-member review team selected from the full-time faculty. At least one member of the team must be from the program discipline of the faculty member under review. At least one member of the team must be tenured. Faculty to be reviewed have the right, without explanation, to have any one member of the team replaced.
4. At least a week before the first classroom visit, the instructor will submit course materials (e.g., syllabus, assignments, examinations) for the review team to provide a context for the course and the class activities they may observe.
5. A complete review will consist of three classroom observations, at least one of which will be unannounced. Team members will observe in pairs and without consultation each will complete the Classroom Observation Rating Form (Appendix A2.1). The rating form will be completed as soon as possible after the visit. Handwritten comments will be typed and the electronic version of the form will be submitted to the Coordinator.
6. The review team will meet with the Coordinator to reach consensus on the evaluation to be provided to the faculty member. The team will prepare a summary of its findings and compile the numerical ratings data.
7. A written summary of the findings will be given to the reviewed faculty member. The faculty member will also receive a compilation of the numerical ratings and the Rating Forms submitted by the reviewers. Oral feedback, the summary, and other documents will be presented to the faculty member in an informal, confidential, and constructive discussion with the peer-review team.
8. Under normal circumstances the review will be completed within 6 weeks of the date of the request.
9. A faculty member may present the summary and numerical compilation from peer evaluations as evidence of quality instruction and improvement for any formal personnel process. Individual evaluations may also be used in combination with the summary statement.

**2.2.4 - PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF FACULTY** (See §205.06)

1. During the first Faculty Meeting of the year the Department Chair initiates the review process by reminding the faculty of the criteria to be considered in the evaluation. These criteria are contained in Section 2.2.2 of this Handbook.
2. Faculty members provide Annual Reports of activities covering the previous calendar year in the form specified by the College of Science and Technology (see Appendix A2.2).
3. Faculty will submit their documents to the Department Chair on February 1 or the weekday closest to it.
4. The complete set of documents will include the Annual Report, a summary of their student evaluations of instruction for the previous calendar year using the form provided by the Department, and a current *Curriculum Vitae*. Both documents will be submitted to the Chair in hard copy *and* electronic form.
5. Department Chair will read the available information, including comments on student evaluations. The Department Chair will write a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, service, and scholarship during the previous calendar year. The Chair will comment on the faculty member's progress toward their next major personnel action (i.e., tenure, promotion, post-tenure review). In addition, the Chair will assign a numerical score between 1 and 5 in each area and an overall score that is weighted by the percent of total workload assigned to each area.
6. Department Chair will meet with each faculty member on an individual basis, to discuss the previous year and present his/her evaluation.
7. If errors of fact or interpretation have been made, the Department Chair may change both the narrative and numerical evaluations to reflect the new understanding. Such changes may require another meeting between the faculty member and the Chair.
8. The faculty member will be asked to sign the evaluation to acknowledge that they have discussed it and received a copy.
9. If the faculty member wishes to do so, he or she may add comments to the evaluation before it is sent to the Dean.
10. Copies of the complete Annual Report with the Chair's evaluation and the CV will become part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

### **2.2.5 - PROCEDURES FOR THE RETENTION OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY** (See §205 and §209)

1. The following procedure applies to full-time tenure-track faculty during their probationary period. The procedure does not apply to temporary or part-time faculty.
2. The Department Chair informs the tenured faculty of upcoming deadlines for reappointment of probationary faculty. If no concerns about the individual's performance are known to the Chair, the message to the tenured faculty will state the intention to reappoint on a specified date. At this time the Chair will ask the tenured faculty to express any concerns they may have about the individual's performance (See §205.02 for additional information).
3. If no expressions of concern are related to the Chair by the specified date, the Chair will consult with the Dean and convey the Department's desire to reappoint. With the Dean's consent, the Department Chair will send the appropriate letter of reappointment.
4. If concerns are expressed, the tenured faculty will meet as a retention committee to consider the matter. The committee may gather information from the individual concerned and other sources to reach a decision. The committee will recommend to the Department Chair, who, with the advice of the committee, will make a recommendation to the Dean of the College. With the Dean's and/or Provost's consent (in the case of non-renewal), the Department Chair will send the appropriate notification letter to the faculty member.
5. The deadlines for the reappointment of tenure-track probationary faculty are established by the Board of Regents (§209). Using August 1 as the start date for faculty employment, probationary faculty in their first year must be informed whether or not they will receive a contract for the following year at least 6 months before the beginning of the next academic year (February 1). Probationary faculty in their second year receive at least 9 months notice (November 1). In their third and subsequent years, probationary faculty are given notice of contract renewal or non-renewal 12 months in advance of the next academic year (August 1).

**2.2.6 - PROCEDURES FOR PRE-TENURE EVALUATIONS** (See §212)

1. On the basis of the guidelines established by the Board of Regents, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Dean of Science and Technology, the Department Chair determines which faculty members are required to undergo Pre-Tenure Review (normally in their third year), and initiates the process by providing each faculty member with a list of the criteria to be considered (Section 2.2.2). Faculty required to undergo Pre-Tenure Review will be notified by September 15 of the academic year during which the review will be done.
2. The faculty member to be evaluated will submit a dossier which addresses the various items identified in Section 2.2.2, with attention to materials concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. At a minimum the dossier should include:
  1. Narrative description of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period of employment and professional plan.
  2. Complete and current *Curriculum Vitae*.
  3. Summary of student evaluations of instruction.
  4. The Annual Review documents for their first two years.

The dossier will be submitted by January 15 of the academic year of the evaluation.

3. The tenured faculty of the Department constitute the Department's Pre-Tenure Review Committee. The Department Chair normally acts as the chair of the committee. When all committee members have had adequate time to review the applicant's dossier (bearing in mind that the process should be completed by February 15), the Chair convenes a meeting of the Committee. During this meeting the committee will discuss the merits of the applicant's file. Each member makes a yes/no recommendation to the Department Chair based on the applicant's dossier, and the Committee usually files a written report with the Chair.
4. With the advice of the Pre-Tenure Review Committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean. The recommendation will contain complete and thorough documentation of all pertinent criteria so that the Dean and the Provost may evaluate the applicant. The Chair will give the faculty member a written summary of the recommendation, a copy of the committee's report (if one was written), and any suggestions for continued progress. Candid, future-oriented discussion of those materials with the faculty member should take place and the Chair may set deadlines for specific goals to be met. The faculty member will have an opportunity to provide a written response which will be appended to the written report submitted to the Dean and filed as part of the permanent personnel record maintained by the Department.
5. Both the Chair and the faculty member will sign the report, indicating that they have discussed it. The Chair should remind the faculty member that a positive Pre-Tenure Review is not a guarantee of tenure and/or promotion. The Department Chair will apprise the Dean of the results of the Pre-Tenure Review conference and will provide the Dean with a copy of the signed report. A copy will also be placed in the faculty member's file in the Department Office.

6. If non-reappointment is recommended, the Chair will discuss the case with the Dean, who will, in turn, convey the recommendation to the Provost (§211.01). With the Provost's approval, the Chair will deliver a letter of non-renewal which is consistent with timetables in the Board of Regents' and University's policies.
7. The Pre-Tenure Review process should be completed by March 15. Subsequent Annual Reviews should assess continued achievement and provide feedback regarding acceptable progress toward tenure and/or promotions.

**2.2.7 – PROCEDURES FOR TENURE EVALUATION** (See §209)

1. Faculty members become eligible for tenure when they have completed the required probationary period, normally six years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Credit may be granted at the time of initial appointment that will reduce the period of probation. The Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook, §209, contains the specifications for probationary credit.
2. On the basis of the guidelines established by the Board of Regents, the Provost, and the Dean of Science and Technology, the Department Chair determines which faculty members are eligible for consideration for tenure, and initiates the process by providing each faculty member with a list of the criteria to be considered (Section 2.2.2).
3. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for tenure should consult with the Department Chair no later than the first week of the academic year on the process, criteria, and evidence to be used in making a recommendation to the Dean of the College.
4. The names and contact information of at least 3 potential outside reviewers of the applicant should be submitted during the consultation with the Department Chair or at a time agreeable to both parties. The Department Chair will contact at least 3 of the people on this list and ask them to provide a review of the applicant's qualifications. The material submitted to the outside reviewers will include (but is not limited to): 1) a complete CV, 2) the narrative portion of the application for tenure; and 3) copies of significant publications. The Chair will include the Department's "Criteria for Evaluation" (Section 2.2.2.) and "Procedures for Tenure Evaluation" (Section 2.2.7).
5. Additional data, such as a summary of student evaluations and letters from outside the Department, maybe added to the faculty member's file.
6. The faculty member to be considered for tenure will submit a dossier which addresses the various items identified in Section 2.2.2, with attention to materials concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. At a minimum the dossier should include:
  1. Narrative description of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period of employment, and the professional plan.
  2. Complete and current *Curriculum Vitae*.
  3. Copy of Pre-Tenure Review evaluation statement.
  4. Copies of the Chair's evaluation statement from all Annual Reviews.
  5. Summary of student evaluations of instruction.
  6. Reprints of publications or other significant products of scholarly activity.

The dossier will be submitted by October 1 of the academic year of the evaluation. Probationary faculty in their 6<sup>th</sup> year of a tenure-track or tenure-eligible appointment who do not submit an application for tenure have, in effect, resigned their position effective at the end of the next academic year.

7. The Tenure Committee will be constituted as described in Section 2.1.11. By ballot or acclamation, the committee will choose a member to serve as its chair. When all committee members have had adequate time to review the applicant's dossier (bearing in mind that the process should be completed by October 30), the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the committee. During this meeting the committee will discuss the merits of the application. Each member makes a yes/no recommendation based on the applicant's dossier, and the committee chair writes the report of the committee to the Department Chair.
8. With the advice of the tenure committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean using the form required by the Office of Academic Affairs (Appendix A2.3). The recommendation will summarize the findings of the tenure committee and its recommendations and provide the rationale for the Chair's recommendation. After discussing the content of the tenure committee's recommendation with the Dean, the Chair will then give the faculty member a written summary of the recommendation and a copy of the committee's report.
9. This procedure must be completed prior to the deadline established by the Dean for acceptance of such recommendations.

**2.2.8 - PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION EVALUATIONS** (See §208)

1. Length of service is a consideration for promotion to the next rank. A promotion will be considered “early” if the candidate has less than the following number of years of service in rank at Georgia Southern University:

To Assistant Professor	3 years
To Associate Professor	4 years
To Professor	5 years

As stated in the University Faculty Handbook (§208), “Early promotions are rare, requiring clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation.”

2. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion should consult with the Department Chair no later than the first week of the academic year on the process, criteria, and evidence used in making a recommendation to the Dean of the College. The Chair will also provide each faculty member with a list of the criteria to be considered in the promotion recommendation (this manual Section 2.2.2).
3. The names and contact information of at least 3 potential outside reviewers of the applicant should be submitted during the consultation with the Department Chair or at a time agreeable to both. The Department Chair will contact at least 3 of the people on this list and ask them to provide a review of the applicant’s qualifications. The material submitted to the outside reviewers will include (but is not limited to): 1) a complete CV, 2) the narrative portion of the application for promotion; and 3) copies of significant publications. The Chair will include the Department’s “Criteria for Evaluation” (Section 2.2.2) and “Procedures for Promotion Evaluation” (Section 2.2.8).
4. The faculty member who wishes to be considered for promotion will submit a dossier which addresses the various items identified in Section 2.2.2, with attention to materials concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. At a minimum the dossier should include:
  1. Narrative description of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period of employment and, the professional plan.
  2. Complete and current *Curriculum Vitae*.
  3. Summary of student evaluations of instruction.
  4. Reprints of publications or other products of scholarly activity.

The dossier will be submitted by October 1 of the year of the evaluation. Additional data, such as a summary of student evaluations and letters from outside the Department, are added to the faculty member’s file as they are received by the Department Chair.

5. The Promotion Committee will be constituted as described in Section 2.1.11. By ballot or acclamation, the committee will choose a member to serve as its chair. When all committee members have had adequate time to review the applicant’s dossier (bearing in mind that the process should be completed by October 30), the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the committee. During this meeting the committee will discuss the merits of the application. At a subsequent meeting, without the Department Chair present, each member makes a recommendation based on the applicant’s dossier. By consensus or vote,

the Committee will reach a decision and make a formal written evaluation of the candidate and a recommendation to the Department Chair.

6. With the advice of the Promotion Committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean using the form required by the Office of Academic Affairs (Appendix A2.4). The recommendation will summarize the findings of the promotion committee and its recommendations and provide the rationale for the Chair's recommendation. After discussing the content of the promotion committee's recommendation with the Dean, the Chair will then give the faculty member a written summary of the recommendation and a copy of the committee's report.
7. This procedure must be completed prior to the deadline established by the Dean for acceptance of such recommendations. The promotion consideration must be completed at the University level by December (§205.05B).

## 2.2.9 - PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW (See §212)

1. Tenured faculty are subject to post-tenure review at least once every five years; five years after their most recent promotion, or other personnel action as specified in §212 of the University's Faculty Handbook. Post-Tenure Review will continue on this schedule until the faculty member retires or resigns from the University (§213 III).
2. The Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook (§213 II) states that the purposes of Post-Tenure Review are as follows:
  1. to recognize and reward tenured faculty who have made and continue to make significant contributions to the mission of their departments, colleges, and the University;
  2. to provide faculty development opportunities for tenured faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, but also scholarship and/or service, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University; and
  3. to provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a tenured faculty member's contributions in teaching, scholarship, and/or service are found to be deficient with respect to the mission of the department, college, or University.
3. On the basis of the guidelines established by the Board of Regents, the Provost, and the Dean of Science and Technology, the Department Chair determines which faculty members are subject to Post-Tenure Review. The Department Chair will notify faculty members who are required to have Post-Tenure Review by September 15 of the calendar year before the review. The Chair will also provide each faculty member with a list of the criteria to be considered in the Post-Tenure Review (this manual Section 2.2.2).
4. The faculty member under post-tenure review will submit a dossier which addresses the various items identified in Section 2.2.2, with attention to materials concerning teaching, scholarship, and service. At a minimum the dossier should include:
  1. Narrative description of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period of employment, and the professional plan.
  2. Complete and current *Curriculum Vitae*.
  3. Summary of recent student evaluations of instruction.
  4. Reprints of publications or other significant products of scholarly activity.
  5. Course materials that demonstrate the quality of instruction.
  6. Copies of Annual Reviews for the 5 years under consideration.

The dossier will be submitted before January 15 of the year of the evaluation.
5. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will be constituted as described in Section 2.1.11. By ballot or acclamation, the committee will choose a member to serve as its chair. When all committee members have had adequate time to review the applicant's dossier (bearing in mind

that the process should be completed by March 1), the Department Chair convenes a meeting of the committee. The duties of the committee are as follows:

1. to review materials submitted by candidates for Post-Tenure Review, and to make a recommendation to the Department Chair concerning their evaluation including recommendations for required formal development plans to address any deficiencies; and,
  2. to review all candidates nominated at the departmental level for reward for meritorious Post-Tenure Reviews and to recommend candidates from that pool for "Tenured Faculty Member of the Year".
6. The Department Chair receives the committee's recommendation and confers with them with regard to his/her decision. The Chair then completes the Post-Tenure Review Form (Appendix A2.5), and holds a conference with each faculty member undergoing review. The purpose of the conference is to inform them of the committee's recommendation and the action the Chair decides to take. Materials and recommendations are then forwarded to the office of the Dean.
7. With the advice of the Post-Tenure Review committee, the Department Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean using the form required by the College of Science and Technology. The recommendation will summarize the findings of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and its recommendations, and provide the rationale for the Chair's recommendation. After discussing the content of the Post-Tenure Review Committee's recommendation with the Dean, the Chair will then give the faculty member a written summary of the recommendation and a copy of the committee's report.
8. A faculty member who disagrees with the result of his or her Post-Tenure Review at the departmental level has the right to appeal within ten (10) working days of signing the Chair's Post-Tenure Review report. Procedures for appeal are clearly described in the Post-Tenure Review document of the College.
9. This procedure must be completed prior to the deadline established by the Dean for acceptance of such recommendations.

## **2.3 - GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENTAL TRAVEL FUNDING**

(See §218)

### **2.3.1 INTRODUCTION**

Professional growth and development are life long commitments of faculty in this department. Professional activity takes a variety of forms, many of which require travel. Georgia Southern University and the Department of Geology and Geography are committed to supporting development activities whenever possible.

Prior to September 1 each faculty member will submit to the Department Chair a list, with approximate cost, of the professional travel anticipated during the academic year. Although these lists will be subject to revision for a variety of reasons (including unanticipated opportunities) they will be used to approximate the anticipated need for travel funds and to establish priorities when necessary. The following prioritized list indicates possible uses for travel money by individual faculty and indicates the maximum percentage of certain expenses that will be reimbursed. Because travel is only one of several needs competing for resources available to the Department, the Chair may limit travel reimbursements to higher priority uses. The final decision regarding appropriate use of travel funds rests with the Chair.

To maximize travel opportunities for all members of the faculty, funding sources external to the Department should be used as frequently as possible. To this end, the Faculty has agreed that *application* for external funding is a prerequisite for receiving funding from the Department for professional travel. When the “Request for Authority to Travel on Official University Business” form is submitted to the Chair, it should be accompanied by an application(s) to one of the University programs listed below or some other source external to the University. If application has not been made to some extra-departmental source, a statement of explanation must accompany the travel request form.

### **2.3.2 EXTRA-DEPARTMENTAL SOURCES OF TRAVEL FUNDS**

Georgia Southern University provides several sources of funds for professional travel. Copies of successful applications to these programs are available from the Chair.

#### **Faculty Development Funding**

Professional Travel Requests are accepted three times each year. The first deadline is typically in mid-September, the second in mid-January, and the third, for travel between July and mid-November, in late March. The program description states: “Funds are available to support professional travel for conference and professional meetings directly related to updating knowledge of the discipline that will impact classroom instruction.” This is an excellent source of travel grants.

#### **Faculty Service Funding**

Faculty Service Grants, with deadlines in early October and early February, provide funds: “(1) to improve the quality of life for the local, state, national or international community through the use of uncompensated professional skills and expertise or (2) to serve the academic community through uncompensated public service to professional and honor societies.” For those holding offices in professional organizations or performing uncompensated services this program should be given careful consideration.

### **College of Science and Technology Academic Excellence Program**

The College of Science and Technology Academic Excellence Program currently has \$5,000 per year to award for a variety of purposes. The maximum grant is usually less than \$500. The Academic Excellence Committee meets once per semester to review proposals, and those dates are posted on the COST web site (<http://cost.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty/dates/>).

In order to gain the maximum benefit from the Department's limited travel funds, faculty members requesting support from the Department must also provide a copy of completed proposals to one of these (or other acceptable) programs or a formal written explanation of why a proposal could not be submitted.

### **2.3.3 - PRIORITIES FOR DEPARTMENT FUNDING OF PROFESSIONAL TRAVEL**

#### **Active Participation at National Conferences**

The cost of transportation, lodging, and registration in this category may be reimbursed according to the following guidelines

- A. Up to 100% for national meetings of first-order professional organizations or special conferences of these organizations (e.g., Penrose Conference). Among many others, such organizations include: The American Association of Geographers, the American Geophysical Union, and the Geological Society of America.
- B. Up to 75% for regional meetings of first-order professional organizations (e.g., the Southeastern Section of the Geological Society of America), regional organizations, and state or local organizations (e.g., Carolina Geological Society)

#### **Priority**

1. Travel to conferences where the participant presents a paper.
2. Travel to conferences where the participant conducts workshops or leads field trips.
3. Travel to conferences where the participant is an officer of the professional organization.
4. Travel to conferences where the participant serves on an invited panel or working group.

#### **Faculty Enrichment Activities and Research Grant Proposal Development**

The cost of travel in this category may be reimbursed up to 50% of expenditures for travel, lodging, and registration. Travel requests of this type require a statement of justification to the Chair. Travel requests involving research proposal development (priorities 5-7) must yield a submitted proposal within a reasonable period following travel (generally up to one year).

5. Travel to conduct background research leading to the development of a research proposal.
6. Travel to meet with granting agency personnel about a research proposal.

7. Travel to other institutions to collaborate on research proposals with colleagues at those institutions.
8. Travel to conferences to participate as a discussant.
9. Travel to meetings or field excursions where papers are not part of the program (e.g., Friends of the Pleistocene).
10. Travel to participate in faculty development activities (short courses, workshops, training in research-related techniques).
11. Travel to give invited talks at other institutions. (These costs should normally be borne by the host institution.)
12. Travel to conferences where there is no active participation.

#### **2.3.4 - INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL**

Participation in international organizations, meetings, and conferences is a highly regarded form of professional activity. International travel is, unfortunately, often too expensive for the Department to fund fully. Faculty should plan to receive most of their support for international travel from outside sources. Even for travel with the highest priority (see above), reimbursement will generally be limited to \$1,000.

## **2.4 – REPORTING ANNUAL LEAVE AND SICK LEAVE** (See §218.03)

### **2.4.1 INTRODUCTION**

Faculty members on academic-year (9-month) appointments accumulate sick leave at the rate of 10 days per academic year with 2 days added for summer teaching. Twelve-month employees accumulate both annual leave (14 hours per month) and sick leave (8 hours per month). Therefore, 12-month employees must request annual leave whereas 9-month faculty do not. The University requires monthly reporting of accrual and usage of sick leave for all employees and annual leave for non-faculty employees.

Faculty are required to report sick leave whenever:

- a) a professional responsibility is missed because of sickness, e.g., a class, departmental meeting, department, college or university committee meeting, etc., and/or
- b) sickness prevents performance of at least 40 hours of professional duties per week.

### **2.4.2 DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS**

#### **Regular Faculty** (0.75 EFT employees)

Faculty members will receive copies of the “Faculty Absence and Leave Statement” form used for reporting purposes. The Department’s Administrative Secretary will complete the recurring portions of the form. Faculty members are responsible for reporting all absences and leave taken during business days.

The signed statement is due in the Department office no later than the 8<sup>th</sup> calendar day of the month following the period reported by the form. The form must be countersigned by the Department Chair and delivered to the Payroll Office no later than the 10<sup>th</sup> day of the month.

Faculty who do not teach summer school are not required to file reports for the months of June and July. Members of the faculty who receive payroll checks during either June or July are required to file reports for those months.

#### **Administration and Staff** (1.00 EFT employees)

Twelve-month employees use the “Employee Absence and Leave Statement” form for reporting accrual and usage of both annual leave and sick leave. The Department’s Administrative Secretary will complete the recurring parts of the form.

The forms for the Administrative Secretary and any other full-time staff are due in the Department office by the 8<sup>th</sup> calendar day of the month following the period reported by the form. The Chair’s form is sent to the Dean of the College for approval.

## **SECTION 3 RESOURCES FOR FACULTY**

### **3.1 - DEPARTMENT INVENTORY**

#### **3.1.1 INVENTORIED PROPERTY**

Georgia Southern University's "Equipment Inventory Policy" (dated March 21, 2002) is part of the Controller's Division Accounting Policy and Procedure Manual. The sections most relevant to the Department are included in Appendix 3.1.

The University maintains a formal inventory of equipment with a capital cost of more than \$3,000 (\$1,000 prior to summer 2003) and a useful life of at least 3 years. Computers (and firearms) are inventoried regardless of their value. Inventoried items are tagged with an individually numbered, bar-coded *white* label. The label is usually, although not always, on a readily accessible surface. *Brown* "Property of Georgia Southern University" tags are used to identify property not included on the inventory.

#### **3.1.2 ANNUAL ASSET INVENTORY**

Georgia Southern does an "Annual Asset Inventory" to which the Department must respond. To aid in this process, the Chair continuously updates the Department's own listing to reflect location changes and additions and deletions from the inventory.

Each member of the faculty is responsible for maintaining the inventory of equipment in his or her office and other spaces assigned to them by the Department Chair (see Appendix 3.2). The University requires that actual locations of property be kept accurately. This means that any piece of inventoried property that is moved from one location to another within the Department must be documented and that no piece of inventoried property should be moved without the knowledge of the person responsible for that item. Faculty will be provided with periodically updated lists of the property for which they are responsible. Faculty members are expected to keep their lists up to date and to notify the Department Chair of any changes. When the Chair asks the Faculty to conduct an inventory of the property under their supervision, every item on the list must be individually inspected to be certain that the property control tag is attached and legible. Any missing item should be reported to the Department Chair immediately. Any item found in the faculty member's assigned space that is not on their inventory should also be reported.

#### **3.1.3 MAINTAINING THE INVENTORY**

Each member of the faculty will have a spreadsheet that lists the inventoried equipment assigned to him or her. These listings should be kept up to date at all times. Although not common, officials of the State conduct spot checks to verify inventories. These officials do not look happily upon units with a poor regard for the property of the State of Georgia.

When they are first delivered to the Department, the room location for most items will not be known and it will be entered either as the Department Office (HERTY1100) or as unknown (HERTY9999). The designation should be changed as soon as possible to reflect the actual location of equipment.

### **3.1.4 OFF-CAMPUS USE OF INVENTORIED PROPERTY**

Before any piece of inventoried equipment is removed from the campus, an “Authorization for Off Campus Equipment Use” form (Form 1-E) should be filed. This form requires the approval of the Department Chair. The form must be on file for the equipment to be covered by University insurance. This means that damage or loss of University-owned equipment that occurs off campus without authorization for off-campus use can result in a claim against an employee and his or her personal insurance. When the equipment is returned to campus, a duplicate copy of the original form is filed with the return date.

### **3.1.5 THEFTS, DAMAGE, AND DISPOSAL OF INVENTORIED PROPERTY**

Thefts of State property should be reported to the Department Chair as soon as the theft is discovered. The Chair will notify the University’s Public Safety Office and work with them to complete the required reports for law enforcement and material management.

Damage to equipment, especially damage that renders the item inoperable, should be reported to the Department Chair immediately.

Inventoried property can only be disposed of through the University. Inventoried property should never be discarded. At least once a year, commonly during the summer, the Department Chair will ask that faculty bring inventoried property that is no longer needed or useful to a central location for reassignment. Faculty will usually be given the opportunity to select items they can use from the surplus before they are returned to the University.

### **3.1.6 DISCREPANCIES IN EQUIPMENT INVENTORY**

Inventory reports are required annually and may occur periodically by University, University System, or State auditors. Inventory discrepancies are serious matters that are reported to both the Dean of College of Science and Technology and the Provost. Discrepancies that cannot be resolved may result in “loss of funds to the department for the value of the equipment item” (Georgia Southern University Equipment Inventory Policy dated March 21, 2002).

## **3.2 - INFORMATION RESOURCES**

Library

GeoRef

### **3.3 – THE SPATIAL ANALYSIS AND GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS LABORATORY (SAGIS)**

## APPENDICES

### SECTION 1

- A1.1 Department of Geology and Geography Program Reviews
- A1.2 Department of Geology and Geography Level III Strategic Plan
- A1.3 The Ideal Department
- A1.4 *Five Steps to Oblivion II* by Ron Abler
- A1.5 *You Probably Think This Song Is About You* by Stanley Fish
- A1.6 *Steps to Secure an Unsuccessful Personnel Search* by Susan L. Cutter

### SECTION 2

- A2.1 Classroom Observation Rating Form
- A2.2 COST Form for Annual Review of Faculty
- A2.3 Academic Affairs Recommendation for Tenure Form
- A2.4 Academic Affairs Recommendation for Promotion Form
- A2.5 Post-Tenure Review Form
- A2.6 Student Evaluation Form
- A2.7 Describing Scholarly Activities and Research: The Motivating, Derivative, and Operational Research Questions

### SECTION 3

- A3.1 Equipment Inventory Policy (dated March 21, 2002)

APENDIX 1.1

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY PROGRAM REVIEWS**

APPENDIX 1.2

**DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY  
LEVEL III STRATEGIC PLAN**

## Strategic Planning Level III

Department of Geology and Geography  
Georgia Southern University

April 24, 2002

## DESCRIPTION OF UNIT AND ITS MISSION

The Department of Geology and Geography contributes broadly to the education of Georgia Southern University students. The Department's course offerings support the Core Curriculum in Areas D1, D2, D3, and E. No other department in the University contributes to four areas of the Core. The Department of Geology and Geography offers course work that leads to a Bachelor of Science degree with a Major in either Geology or Geography and a Bachelor of Arts degree with Major in Geology. The Department has a formal Minor in Geographic Information Systems. Geographic Information Science is one of the approved Second Disciplines in the School of Information Technology. The Department oversees three special purpose laboratories: the Earth Science Computer Applications Laboratory (ESCAL), the Spatial Analysis and Geographic Information Systems (SAGIS) Laboratory, and the Applied Coastal Research Laboratory (ACRL) located on the campus of the Skidaway Institute of Oceanography. The ACRL is Georgia Southern's research facility for marine and coastal science. With the world as our subject, the Department provides field experiences in Georgia, across the United States, and in other countries (e.g., Ecuador, Britain, and Ireland). In all these settings, quality teaching is the program's highest priority.

The geography program serves the largely rural south Georgia region. Faculty are actively involved in regional historical geography, cultural geography, regional economic development (GIS applications), environmental quality, and biogeographic and conservation issues. The program graduates students who are geographically literate, clear-thinking, articulate in oral and written presentation, and effective problem solvers. The geography faculty works to lift south Georgia's educational attainment through the pre-service teacher education program at Georgia Southern.

Geology is by its very nature a broad, eclectic science with many applications to a range of fundamental scientific issues. As the most integrative of sciences, geology is also the one most directly concerned with the major environmental issues of resources, hazards, and planning. The geology faculty has expertise in the core areas of mineralogy, petrology, stratigraphy, structural geology, paleontology, hydrology, and geomorphology. Georgia Southern's geology program emphasizes oral and written communication skills, research and problem solving ability, and teamwork, producing graduates who succeed in diverse and challenging work environments and in graduate programs.

The combined Department of Geology and Geography provides a broad spectrum of faculty expertise, curriculum choices, and learning opportunities for students. The Department functions as an integrated unit, sharing equipment, laboratory and classroom space, and common courses. Because the Department is closer to the coast than any similar program in the University System, the geology and geography programs pursue a shared identity as the center for the study of Coastal Georgia, providing unique opportunities for teaching, learning, and research.

## **STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS**

### **(1) Strengths**

- 1.1 Combined geology and geography department with complementary programs.
- 1.2 Energetic, high quality faculty with strong interests in teaching, research, and service.
- 1.3 Coastal Plain location provides opportunities that build on departmental interests and expertise.
- 1.4 Strong and growing geography and GIS programs.
- 1.5 Excellent computer facilities, GIS, remote sensing, and geoscience applications.
- 1.6 Favorable student to faculty ratio, particularly in upper division courses.
- 1.7 Laboratories at all levels taught by faculty rather than student assistants.
- 1.8 Existing instructional space is well-equipped and recently renovated.
- 1.9 Active faculty research programs involving undergraduates.
- 1.10 Increasingly diverse faculty by gender.

### **(2) Weaknesses**

- 2.1 Insufficient space for offices, instruction, and research.
- 2.2 Insufficient technical and secretarial staff.
- 2.3 Lack of any instrumentation for compositional analysis of earth materials.
- 2.4 Inefficient use of faculty time due to lack of technical support and room size limitations.
- 2.5 Lack of graduate program in geoscience or environmental science.
- 2.6 Limited library holdings for GIS, geology, and geography journals.

### **(3) Opportunities**

- 3.1 Potential to increase space because of Department of Chemistry moves to new facilities.
- 3.2 GIS program is timely and responsive to workforce needs.
- 3.3 Growing interest in interdisciplinary projects with a GIS component.
- 3.4 Research programs pertinent to regional water-supply issues.
- 3.5 Coastal studies pertinent to our location.
- 3.6 Interest in expanded teacher education.
- 3.7 Potential for graduate research projects utilizing our strengths in environmental issues.
- 3.8 Interdisciplinary research with chemistry or biology as well as within the department.

### **(4) Threats**

- 4.1 Slow approval of the Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Geography.
- 4.2 Declining operating budget.
- 4.3 Relatively small numbers of majors in geology and geography.
- 4.4 Obligated to relocate SAGIS in summer 2003 and no available replacement space in Herty.
- 4.5 Uncertain financial support for software licenses, hardware replacement, and laboratory staffing.

## **LONG RANGE GOALS**

Our strategic goals are listed in priority below and are related to appropriate elements among the six institutional strategic themes (in parentheses) outlined in the Institutional Strategic Plan, April, 2000. The grand strategic goal to which all these contribute is for this Department to become generally recognized as the outstanding program for undergraduate studies in geology and geography in the University System of Georgia

### **Enlarge and enhance Department's facilities**

(Weakness 2.1, 2.3, 2.4; Threat 4.4)

(Themes: Physical Environment, Academic Distinction, Technological Advancement, Student-Centered University)

*GOAL:* Obtain space for additional teaching and research laboratories, a larger lecture room, storage space, conference room, and student work area, and so that all the geology and geography faculty can have offices in the Herty Building.

*Tactic:* As the chemistry department departs the Herty Building, we assume occupancy.

*GOAL:* Acquire additional research equipment to ensure the presence of sound technological support for faculty and students. The Department has no instrumentation for the analysis of earth materials. More problematical is the total lack of suitable space for such instrumentation.

*Tactic:* With opportunities to increase laboratory space in the near future, increase efforts already undertaken to secure grants for purchase of new equipment.

### **Improve our visibility within the community of earth scientists at large**

(Strengths 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.9; Opportunities 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8)

(Themes: Student-Centered University, Academic Distinction)

*GOAL:* Become the premier site within the USG for coastal studies and GIS applications and the largest and most comprehensive undergraduate geoscience program in the state.

*Tactic:* Continue to hire exceptionally good faculty.

*Tactic:* Establish the Bachelor of Arts Degree with a Major in Geography.

*Tactic:* Establish a Master of Science in Environmental Sciences degree program in the COST as an option for Georgia Southern students to pursue graduate studies in geology or geography.

*Tactic:* Increase the number of majors to 1% of the Georgia Southern University undergraduate student body.

*GOAL:* Gain a regional and then national reputation as a key organization in studies of the Atlantic Coastal Plain.

*Tactic:* Encourage faculty participation in national and international meetings of premier scientific organizations.

*Tactic:* Encourage faculty participation in editorial boards and as reviewers for National Science Foundation programs, and peer reviewed journals.

*Tactic:* Host regional meetings of the Geological Society of America and Association of American Geographers.

### **Enhance the Geographic Information System program**

(Strengths 1.4, 1.5; Weakness 2.1, 2.6; Opportunities 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8; Threats 4.2, 4.4, 4.5)

(Themes: Physical Environment, Academic Distinction, Private and Public Partnerships, Technological Advancement)

*GOAL:* Establish a Center for Geographic Information Systems in Southeastern Georgia.  
*Tactic:* Move the Spatial Analysis and Geographic Information Systems (SAGIS) lab into Herty Building.  
*Tactic:* Establish GIS certification program.  
*Tactic:* Design and seek approval of a major in GIS.

*GOAL:* Support for the software and hardware needs of SAGIS.  
*Tactic:* Secure laboratory fees as well as other institutional funds to purchase and maintain licenses and replace hardware on a regular schedule.  
*Tactic:* Obtain contracts for specific GIS tasks with appropriate overhead.

### **Increase secretarial and technical staff**

(Weakness 2.2, 2.4)

(Themes: Student-Centered University, Physical Environment, Technological Advancement)

*GOAL:* Increase staff support, including a manager for the SAGIS and ESCAL, a department technician, and another secretarial position.  
*Tactic:* Secure institutional funding to support these positions in a sustained and sufficient manner.

### **Continue contributions to teacher education programs in Georgia**

(Strengths 1.2, 1.3, 1.4; Opportunities 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, Threats 4.3)

(Themes: Student-Centered University, Private and Public Partnerships, Academic Distinction)

*GOAL:* Enhance cooperation with the College of Education to support content-based curriculum development.  
*Tactic:* Seek extramural funding, similar to what is currently being done with the Okefenokee Education and Research Center via the Coastal Rivers Water Policy and Planning Center.

### **Strengthen the Applied Coastal Research Lab**

(Strength 1.3, 1.9; Weakness 2.1; Opportunities 3.5, 3.7, 3.8)

(Themes: Physical Environment, Academic Distinction, Technological Advancement)

*GOAL:* Complete renovations of the laboratory space.  
*Tactic:* Continue to solicit institutional support, applying for grant money when appropriate; support on-going renovations and research.

*GOAL:* Secure a successor for Jim Henry as Director of the ACRL.  
*Tactic:* Obtain a commitment to continue Georgia Southern's presence on the Skidaway campus by fully funding Director's position.  
*Tactic:* Begin a search for the new Director as soon as Dr. Henry announces his resignation.

## **IMMEDIATE PRIORITIES FOR ACTION**

(Tactics for the next 12 months)

The lack of space for the Department of Geology and Geography is the greatest impediment to the Department's growth and development. This is largely due to insufficient space for classrooms, offices, analytical equipment, and laboratories. The Department places a high priority on attracting majors to the geology and geography programs. Thus, the number of geoscience majors and concomitant space requirements are increasing rapidly. The Department does not have sufficient secretarial and technical staff support for its many activities. The priorities for action listed below address these general concerns, as well as the immediate steps to begin implementation of the Department's long-range goals.

### **Begin planning to increase space allotted to the Department** (Weakness 2.1)

(Themes: Physical Environment, Academic Distinction, Technological Advancement, Student-Centered University)

- The Department of Chemistry will soon move out of Herty Building, freeing the space needed for the Department of Geology and Geography to grow and prosper.
- We should provide all faculty offices in Herty Building.
- The SAGIS lab will be moved from 1004 Carruth to Herty no later than summer 2003. Moving SAGIS into Herty will require funding for renovation and new hardware.
- The amount of laboratory space in Herty Building must be increased for instruction and for faculty and student research.
- Growth in the number of majors necessitates additional general student workspace.

### **Approval of Bachelor of Arts Degree with a Major in Geography** (Threat 4.1, 4.3)

(Themes: Academic Distinction, Student-Centered University, Transcultural Opportunities)

- The BS degree requires a senior project and emphasizes science, a background most appropriate for physical geography. This limits the growth of the geography program. The Bachelor of Arts program will be more appropriate for students interested in the human and cultural aspects of geography. Addition of the BA degree should produce a substantial increase in the number of majors.
- Secure approval for the BA in Geography as soon as possible.

### **Increase secretarial and technical staff** (Weakness 2.1, and 2.4)

(Themes: Technological Advancement, Student-Centered University)

- We need technical staff in several areas including systems administration, equipment maintenance, laboratory and lab materials management, and computer lab staffing.
- Increase office staff by at least one person.

### **Continue efforts to recruit new majors** (Opportunity 3.2, 3.6; Threat 4.3)

(Themes: Academic Distinction, Student-Centered University, Private and Public Partnerships)

- Actively recruit majors from our large introductory classes, and through participation in University open houses.
- Recruit more majors as they enter the University as freshmen.
- Begin recruiting majors from local high schools through a variety of activities.

### **Improve information resources** (Weakness 2.6)

(Themes: Academic Distinction, Technological Advancement)

- As part of the program review, a number of periodical subscriptions were dropped.
- Work with the library to ensure that our recommendations for additional and substitute journal subscriptions are implemented.

## **NET CHANGES IN RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

Department priorities are those identified in the Level II Program Review. Space is the primary factor limiting Department's growth and performance, especially in research. Under-staffing and equipment and information resources are additional constraints. These priorities must be tied to budget increases and new revenue sources to provide for renovations, lab furniture, supplies, additional salaries, and enhanced access to information resources.

### **Facilities**

Needs and Issues:

SAGIS - move from Carruth by 2003.

Research Space - current space used for teaching/research/storage.

- no space for new research equipment if acquired.

Faculty Offices - 8 faculty currently in Anderson Hall.

Large lecture room needed - enrollments near maximum for current room size.

Solution:

Acquire remainder of Herty when Department of Chemistry moves.

Make resources available to cover major and minor renovations, furniture, electronic equipment necessary for "smart" classrooms, and lab equipment.

### **Equipment**

Needs and Issues:

Improvements in equipment for student laboratories (at both the introductory and advanced levels).

Instrumentation for student and faculty research.

Replacement of and enhancement to faculty computers.

Replacement of computers in SAGIS and ESCAL on a regular schedule.

Solutions:

Institute laboratory fees for all laboratory courses.

Write proposals for direct extramural funding of equipment purchases.

Write proposals to Student Technology Fee program every year.

Use research grants for equipment purchase and replacement whenever possible.

Acquire GIS contract work with appropriate overhead.

### **Staffing**

Needs and Issues:

Student assistants in SAGIS and ESCAL.

Secretarial - one secretary for two programs plus three special purpose labs.

Technical - need permanent technical staff for SAGIS and ESCAL.

Solution:

Increased budget to hire additional staff (one secretary, one technician).

Write proposals to Student Technology Fee program every year for additional work study funds to increase the number of hours that SAGIS and ESCAL can be kept open.

Institute laboratory fees in all laboratory courses.

Acquire GIS contract work with appropriate overhead.

### **Information resources**

Needs and Issues:

Periodical access is extremely limited for some disciplines (geochemistry, petrology, structural geology, GIS, hydrology).

Monographs - one of the lowest allocations in the University.

Solution: Increased budget for monographs and electronic or standard access to periodicals.

## OUTCOME ASSESSMENT PLAN

### **Facilities** - Indicators of successful space acquisition include:

- All faculty have office space in the Herty Building, with a minimum space of 180 ft<sup>2</sup> per faculty member.
- The average research/laboratory and analytical equipment space for all faculty is 300 ft<sup>2</sup> per faculty member.
- Relocation of the SAGIS Lab from Carruth to an equivalent space in Herty (approximately 1000 ft<sup>2</sup>).
- Adequate classroom space for World Regional Geography and Environmental Geology classes (maximum class size of 120 students).

### **Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Geography** - Indicators of a success include:

- An approved Bachelor of Arts Degree with a Major in Geography.
- 10 students completing courses with a goal of receiving a BA in Geography.

### **Recruitment of majors**- Indicators of successful recruitment of majors include:

- Number of majors equal to 1% of Georgia Southern's undergraduate enrollment.
- At least 5 incoming students as declared geology or geography majors each year.
- Increased ethnic and gender diversity among geology and geography majors.

### **Enhancement of GIS program** - Indicators of successful enhancement include:

- A 100% increase in the number of geography majors and GIS minors declared today.
- Sustained and sufficient funding from the University to upgrade and replace computer hardware for the ESCAL and SAGIS every three years.
- Software for ESCAL, SAGIS, and faculty is updated annually.

### **Staffing** - Indicators of sufficient staff include:

- At least 1.5 administrative secretaries and adequate office support staff (i.e. work-study students).
- Sufficient staff to keep SAGIS open 30 hours per week.
- At least one employee who is responsible for systems administration and equipment maintenance.

### **Information resources** - Indicators of sufficient information resources include:

- 8,000 bound volumes in geology and 3,200 bound volumes in geography in the Henderson Library.
- Subscriptions to at least 75 journals in geology and geography including, new subscriptions to support initiative in geographical information science.

## APPENDIX 1.3

**The PKAL 2002 Summer Institute Daily Newsletter:  
The Ideal Department****Vision**

- \* Has a common agenda, or at least a non-conflicting agenda.
- \* The ideal department has a plan, a vision for the future.
- \* Everyone "pushing the wagon" in the same, agreed upon direction.
- \* Has a clear vision with effective (and flexible) leadership.
- \* Has a stated and understood mission.
- \* Has clearly stated rules and regulations.
- \* Has strategic (rational) plan for going after grants.

**Resources**

- \* Department has sufficient resources (budget, facilities, people, equipment).
- \* Has a great administrative assistant.
- \* Has a reasonably good physical plant with excellent technical support.
- \* IS RICH !!!!

**Students and Student Learning**

- \* All faculty realize they exist because of the students.
- \* Focused on student learning and student retention.
- \* Responsive to student needs. A Student-friendly environment.
- \* Dynamic curriculum with continual evaluation and strategic change.
- \* Universal commitment to excellence.
- \* Can quickly respond to changes in technology.
- \* Offers challenging courses for both majors and non-majors.
- \* Large enrollment of sharp, motivated majors.
- \* Coordinated course offerings.
- \* Good placement testing of students.
- \* Good advising and mentoring of students.
- \* Has programs where students can get involved in research as early as possible.
- \* Students feel they are a part of a group and are excited to be in college.

**Leadership**

- \* Has a politically astute department chair.
- \* Has an open-minded management.
- \* Has a chairperson with no agenda except to facilitate.
- \* Has a chairperson that provides constructive feedback.
- \* Transparency in decision-making by administrators.
- \* Has a chair that represents the department well to the administration.
- \* Shared leadership/governance. Strong sustained leadership.
- \* Enthusiastic leadership which ensures all faculty are rewarded for the contributions.

## Collegiality

- \* Can agree to disagree.
- \* Not threatened by having personal views challenged. Willingness to park egos.
- \* Everyone works and plays well with others.
- \* Minimal amount of "deadwood" in department.
- \* Senior faculty are not automatically treated as deadwood and conservative just because they have been around a little longer and have more wisdom than the younger faculty.
- \* Collegiality, common goals, and fairness in decision-making.
- \* Respect for all members (faculty, staff, students) and their contributions to the mission.
- \* Will not settle "scores" by encouraging student unrest.
- \* Operates through consensus building. Has members that are able to compromise.

## Environment

- \* Environment conducive to innovation and risk-taking.
- \* Has a mixture of perspectives, communication styles, and experience
- \* Good diversity in terms of age, gender, background, ethnicity, and experience.
- \* Relaxed friendly atmosphere.
- \* Fair workload and compensation.
- \* Shared sense of humor.
- \* Nurtures new and established faculty.
- \* Is alert to needs and special circumstances of faculty members.
- \* Cohesive and cooperative faculty.
- \* Shared responsibilities.
- \* Innovative programs abound.
- \* Is willing to try novel approaches with emerging technologies.
- \* A place where ideas are freely exchanged and objectively debated.
- \* Frequent assemblies to share work with colleagues.
- \* Encourages innovation.
- \* Has a sense of communal mission.
- \* Sharing of burdens.
- \* Harmony between faculty and students.
- \* Good relationships with other departments.
- \* Serves the needs of both faculty and students while creating and disseminating new knowledge.

## Spirit

- \* A sense that if the department as whole succeeds, all faculty members benefit.
- \* Shared spirit of adventure.
- \* Sense of security and an entrepreneurial spirit.
- \* Faculty that are engaged beyond the job description.
- \* Have at least some people that think outside the box.
- \* "Can do" rather than "we have already tried that" spirit.
- \* Common sense of purpose, but with individual expertise.
- \* Support and recognition for efforts in research, teaching, and service.
- \* Has more than one department cheerleader.
- \* Made up of people who have ideas and are eager to hear the ideas of others.
- \* People within the department have social interactions outside of the department.
- \* Willingness to give up an idea when something better comes along.

## **Scholarship**

- \* Good scholarship present with a strong research base.
- \* Faculty are professionally current in their fields.
- \* Faculty have academic colleagues beyond the campus.
- \* Faculty regularly publish in journals.
- \* Faculty have appropriate credentials.

## **Other Characteristics**

- \* An effective learning community.
- \* A department that is an integral part of the campus community.
- \* Has a dynamic faculty development program that is supported by colleagues.
- \* Is concerned with faculty professional growth and career development.
- \* Good connections to the local community.
- \* Alumni are successful and department stays in touch with them.
- \* Reasonable and effective committee structures.
- \* C3 – Communication, Cooperation, and Community.
- \* R4 – Recognition, Resources, Rewards, and Risk-takers.
- \* A department where at least one person has a summer house on a beach.

[http://www.pkal.org/si/department\\_characteristics.html](http://www.pkal.org/si/department_characteristics.html)

Last Update: 06/10/2002

© Copyright 2002 Project Kaleidoscope

## APPENDIX 1.4

**FIVE STEPS TO OBLIVION II**

AAG Newsletter January 2000  
Guest Presidential Column

by Ron Abler

It's been twelve years and six months since my prose appeared in this space. Reg Golledge wanted a month off and invited me to fill in for him. My musings about a topic were interrupted by call from a geography department that had just been placed on the chopping block by its university curriculum committee. That gloomy news called to mind a little essay published in 1993, which seems worth a second outing:

"It has come to my attention that some college and university faculty remain untutored in the techniques that ensure a program's demise. These parlous times in academia would seem to guarantee that any program harboring the slightest death wish would soon be accorded martyrdom, yet some college and university administrators remain stubbornly convinced of the intellectual value of certain programs, despite their lackluster performance.

Herewith, therefore, a sure-fire prescription for overcoming administrative resistance to closing a program. It will work even in the most refractory cases.

- 1) Elect and re-elect a weak chair who cannot lead the faculty to consensus on an appropriate program mission, and who cannot articulate the program's contributions to campus colleagues and to administrators who allocate resources. (This is a critical step; success here virtually assures that several subsequent steps will follow automatically.)
- 2) Lose several of your most productive colleagues, upon whom much of your program's intra- and extra-mural reputation depends. Do not replace them with individuals of comparable accomplishment and prestige. University administrators will never compare the program's past glory with its present status when they decide how to allocate scarce resources.
- 3) Eschew undergraduate education and majors; they are clearly beneath your program's dignity. The preoccupation of university officers with statistics on undergraduate instruction is typical administrative bean counting. If those pesky undergraduates persist in trying to enroll in your program, assign your largest courses to your worst instructors or to marginal graduate students who need to learn how to teach. Make sure advising is slipshod and callous.
- 4) Forego participation in campus governance, which is well known to be a complete waste of time. A quality program consisting of thoughtful scholars will never need friends in key campus positions. Curriculum committees are especially noxious; avoid them like the plague.
- 5) Glory in bitter ideological and personal vendettas. Never-*ever*-fail to denounce your opponent(s) to your dean and provost. They have infinite patience with internal bickering and they will never conclude that *both* sides of the dispute have correctly assessed their adversaries.

Any three of these steps will normally place a program on the endangered list. Four should suffice even where administrators really value your subject. All five will normally overcome any reservations held by even the most ardently committed dean or provost. Yet there are, unfortunately, instances in which extreme measures are necessary.

6) When all else fails, war against your dean. There is no chance that he or she will prevail against a mighty program like yours.”

Since 1993, a number of programs seem to have missed the irony in this tongue-in-cheek prescription—a moment’s reflection on the history of any program that has been terminated, merged, or endangered in the last seven years will reveal one or several of these processes at work. Through my immersion in AAG affairs since 1984, I’ve learned more than I ever wanted to know about failing and failed departments, and it seems to me that the caveats encapsulated in the five steps plus one continue to offer good advice for the future.

Four additional points seem worth stressing. First, threatened programs are, almost by definition, beyond salvation. By the time university committees and administrators talk openly about eliminating or merging a program, neither frantic action by faculty and alumni nor intervention by professional societies such as the AAG can do much good. Universities and their administrators view gratuitous advice and opinions from outsiders as unwarranted interference in their internal affairs. In human terms, it’s well nigh impossible for a committee or administrator to retract a proposal for merger or termination once it has become public. Moreover, such recommendations usually damage the local credibility of the program irreparably.

Second, it follows that the time for marginal or mediocre programs to take remedial action arises well before (years before) they become threatened. If one or more of the six steps to oblivion sounds uncomfortably familiar for your program, get to work immediately. Seek external assistance and advice now, and do so in collaboration with your college and university administrators. Few university officials will fail to provide moral support for external advice when presented with a tightly reasoned case that your program is doing well but could do more for its college and university with the benefit of an external evaluation. Most administrators will provide the minimal financial support needed for an external evaluation, and if your institution cannot provide the means, the AAG will find a way to put competent advisors on your campus. Involving key administrators in the review is critical; because they have asked for it, they will be morally bound to accord the external advice some consideration.

Third, in fifteen years of trying to rescue troubled and threatened programs, I have met but one university administrator who may have acted out of malice toward geography and geographers per se. That’s the exception that proves the rule that no sane dean or provost will harm or hassle a program that contributes effectively to his or her institution. Conduct your program in ways that give your dean bragging rights among his peers and your provost bragging rights among hers, and you’ll never fear oblivion. Sadly, almost all geography’s wounds have been self-inflicted.

Fourth, bear in mind that merger or termination almost always means oblivion. There was a time when academic institutions could afford to clean house and rebuild troubled programs. Rehabilitating dysfunctional or unproductive programs is now more difficult given current financial constraints. Moreover geography is not among the disciplines administrators view as essential to campus life. A university administration may believe it has no choice but to rehabilitate an ailing or failing history program. Geography will likely be viewed as expendable, and degrees and programs lost now are almost certainly gone forever. Dark ruminations for a new year, decade, century, and maybe even millennium (depending on your numerical theology)? No question. Helpful considerations for such occasions? I think so. Geography prospers these days, as is evident in the record number of positions advertised in this and the previous issue of the AAG Newsletter. Yet components of the enterprise continue to self-destruct. Let us therefore adopt Pogo’s famous dictum as the watchword for the beginnings 2000 offers: “We have met the enemy and it are us.”

## APPENDIX 1.5

**YOU PROBABLY THINK THIS SONG IS ABOUT YOU**

by Stanley Fish

All happy departments are alike. All unhappy departments are unhappy in their own way. Let me count the ways.

You know it's an unhappy department if it is fissured by quarrels the origins of which no one remembers, in part because the original combatants have long since died. In departments unhappy in this way, dead people often end up having more power (and votes) than the people who claim to be alive.

You know it's an unhappy department if its discussions are conducted in code, and procedural questions stand in for the substantive issues that are never allowed to surface. Once this decorum is established, it exerts a pressure such that no one ever gets to say what he or she really thinks; and although the ever smaller battles do get won and lost, the department always loses because its pathologies are never confronted.

You know it's an unhappy department if a mania for democracy has supplanted any sense of what the enterprise is really for. Members of this kind of unhappy department think that they are in the business of being fair and equitable rather than in the business of history or chemistry or economics. Of course there is nothing wrong with fairness and equity, but you have to have something to be fair and equitable about, and it is easy to congratulate yourself for upholding values that crowd out the values -- rigor, knowledge, judgment, truth -- that constitute academic work.

You know it's an unhappy department if its bylaws are longer and more complicated than many of the articles department members write. The general rule is that the longer the bylaws the unhappier the department. This is so because the motive for length is to take into account the interests of all factions, with the result that every turf battle, imagined slight, baseless jealousy, and ungrounded anxiety is accorded constitutional status and guaranteed eternal life.

You know it's an unhappy department if there are two of them; if, in the heat of internecine warfare, one side has declared itself independent of the other and persuaded a hapless administration to set up a separate shop. What you then have is a situation in which authority is diluted in the manner of the Avignon papacy or of the multiple organizations that proclaim three different persons the undisputed heavyweight champion of the world. Where you once had a single weak department, you now have two, each of which defines itself in relation to the (supposed) illegitimacy, rapacity, and duplicity of the other. Departments in this fix should, in the interest of truth in advertising, display a sign on the office door proclaiming, "Damaged Goods, all ye who enter here should have your heads examined."

You know it's an unhappy department if individual members delight in hanging out the department's dirty laundry in public for any and all to see, running first to deans and then to provosts and ultimately to trustees and the tabloid press. As despicable as this behavior is, blame should fall not on the perpetrators but on the department that cannot conduct its own business in-house and commands so little allegiance that the category "harmful to the department's interest" has no place in the minds of its members who think of themselves as acting out of the purest motives, even as they perform in ways that make both themselves and the unit they supposedly

represent pariahs in the eyes of the very administrators they petition. (Nothing marks a department as a bad and unhappy one more surely than this particular version of professional suicide.)

You know it's an unhappy department if there is a departmental salary committee that works from a "price list" of activities, awarding so much for a book, so much for a refereed article, so much for an unrefereed article, so much for a footnote, so much for an appearance at your daughter's third-grade class. There is a perverse economy to this procedure, which assures that the scorecard of everyone's failures and humiliations -- along with the successes that spread pain evenly to those who haven't had them -- can be publicly displayed and given their precise monetary value down to the last penny. (This is the financial equivalent of the bylaws that are longer than the sum of all the departmental CV's.)

You know it's an unhappy department if the decision to hire turns even partly on the question of whether a potential new colleague will be paid more than long-time department members at the same or even higher rank. (This is the "fairness bogey" once again raising its irrelevant head.) The truth is that if this is not the case you're not hiring or trying to hire the right people, who, because they are the right people, will be commanding top-dollar prices in a market that is very different from the market in place when your veterans first came aboard. Given the inverse relationship between institutional longevity and current market value (the longer you stay at a place, the more you will fall behind, independently of, and indeed because of, your years of service), what is now called "salary compression" is inevitable, and cannot be corrected on the spot (although the fact of it can lead to a strategy for narrowing the gap between the newcomers and the old hands). Salary compression can be avoided by the simple expedient of only hiring at salaries in line with the salaries already being paid to those at the designated rank; but if you do that, you will be choosing from the bottom of the barrel (except in those once-in-a-while instances where a top-flight person just has to live in the area, and that won't last forever), and you will lose the chance to add new and invigorating scholars to the departmental mix -- a loss actively desired by some unhappy members of some unhappy departments.

You know it's an unhappy department if the department turns its administrative and collective eyes away from the misdemeanors and possible felonies of a rogue member -- someone who fails to meet classes or office hours, someone whose instruction bears no relationship to what is stated in the course catalog, someone who hasn't been to department meetings in years because they are scheduled on days when the dog must be taken to therapy, someone who votes (usually negatively) on personnel matters without ever having met the candidate or read the materials, someone who eats up a disproportionate share of department resources (telephone, copying, travel, secretarial time) while reserving the benefit of grants and research funds jealously to himself, someone who involves students in projects for which she is being paid by outside agencies, someone who involves students in his or her personal quarrels, someone who harasses and makes life difficult for people (staff members, students, junior colleagues, women, men, anyone), someone who is quite possibly a sexual predator, someone who regularly and semi-publicly displays contempt for the attributes (religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, political views) of those he hates or fears. When such a person is not called to account for his or her behavior, the result is not simply that someone has gotten away with something (or with many things); the more significant result is that a cancer has entered the department's bloodstream, infecting all of its activities, including those far removed from the behavior that has been allowed to continue. Such a department is rotting from within and it will only be a matter of time before there is nothing left but ruins and shards and disease.

You know it's an unhappy department when the person who answers the phone (if the phone is answered) does so in languid, lugubrious tones and displays energy only when he or she is unable to answer your question and takes genuine and animated pleasure at being unable to direct you to someone who can. This is not a staff failure; it is a failure in training, supervision,

and ethos. The performance of a staff member is an index of the degree to which a department knows its business and is concerned that it be done professionally. Bad staff performance is a sure sign that Conrad's flabby devil has found a home and taken over.

In the same vein, you know it's an unhappy department if the halls it inhabits are lined with old, decaying furniture, the lights are out, and the offices are empty.

Obviously this taxonomy is far from complete, and I invite readers who do not recognize their own unhappy departments in this partial inventory to send in additional items. Meanwhile it is perhaps time to speculate on the reasons why so many (certainly not all) departments are unhappy. One reason is an attachment -- often not recognized by those who feel it -- to a bad history that might include a grand fight in a meeting 15 years ago, a soft-core decision to promote someone who now spits out the corrosive venom of a person who knows that he or she is here only by virtue of an act of condescension bitterly resented (this kind of resentment will outlast plutonium), a determination to settle old scores again and again and again, the perception of favoritism, the reality of hard times with its attendant deprivations and scarcities. What is curious is that after a while this structure of discontents is the only thing some department members are content with; in fact they love it and don't want to give it up. Once on a site visit, I asked an assembled department if it wanted to move ahead with new projects and renewed vision or if it preferred to go on as before and make its pain its treasure. The response was a little like Jack Benny's famous answer to the question put to him by a thief. "Your money or your life?" Like Benny, they wanted to think it over.

Now I'm not saying that there is no substance to the memories and investments that unhappy departments finger and caress. Bad things do happen (many inflicted by forces from the outside), but a good and healthy organization will face them down, regroup, and gather itself for the next chapter in the fight for good and glory. But it is unlikely to do so in the absence of strong and encouraging leadership, and that is a second key reason why unhappy departments tend to persist in their unhappiness -- the want of a leader who can break with the past and turn negative energies into positive resolve. Just how a leader does that and with what resources garnered from what coffers is a long story, filled with as many hazards as hopes, and it is a story that must wait for another column.

One more thing: Some who read this column will be moved to respond by saying (or writing), "You know it's an unhappy department if Stanley Fish is its chair." I just wanted to say it first, although, of course, it wouldn't be true.

---

Stanley Fish, dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois at Chicago, writes a monthly column for the Career Network on campus politics and academic careers. His most recent book is *How Milton Works* (Harvard University Press, 2001).

March 1, 2002

This article from *The Chronicle* is available online at this address:

<http://chronicle.com/jobs/2002/03/2002030101c.htm>

## APPENDIX 1.6

**STEPS TO SECURE AN UNSUCCESSFUL PERSONNEL SEARCH**

AAG Newsletter November 2000  
President's Column

by Susan L. Cutter

This is the time of year when the number of advertisements in Jobs in Geography increases as academic departments secure permission to hire new faculty for the next school year. The recruitment of new faculty is one of the most important decisions academic departments make (along with tenure and promotion), and the decision making is often contentious, even in the most collegial of units. Given the significance of hiring (it doesn't matter at what level), I have been amazed how clumsily we often handle the search process and how dumbfounded we are when our recruitment efforts fail.

I therefore offer my insights into the search process based on my experience as chair of numerous search committees and as recipient of the horror stories told by my graduate students as they return from interviews. IF your goal is [to] have a less than successful search, just follow the steps outlined below.

**1. Request reference letters from all candidates as part of the application process.** This tactic will not only bury you in paperwork, but will enable you to get the least informative letters possible. Referees will simply change the name and address of the generic word-processed letter, and not alter its content for your specific position. If you're lucky the letter will be current and not recycled from last year's job search.

**2. Develop an advertisement for everything, so that no one person fits the description.** If you don't want to hire in any given year describe a position for which very few people can qualify, using a number of specialties that don't really fit most candidate's profiles. A remote sensing human geographer with Latin American regional experience who can teach advanced climatology, social theory, and spatial statistics is one example. If you want a shallow pool of candidates from which to choose, write a shallow ad.

**3. Make sure the search committee has a majority of soon-to-be retired faculty members.** Those established tenured faculty who lament the direction of contemporary geography and who also have firm and vocal agendas about replacing their sub fields (and thus themselves) are best. Keep in mind that these colleagues will not have to live with the hiring decision that is made.

**4. Never send an acknowledgement letter and never let the candidate know where she stands in the hiring process.** This is a surefire way to get e-mails and phone calls from anxious candidates who have no idea whether materials were received or the status of their applications. If you want to foster a couldn't care less culture and inhospitable work environment, this will help greatly.

**5. Ask the candidate to stay over a Saturday night to reduce expenses and then fail to handle local arrangements.** This entails having the candidate find his own way to the hotel, leaving him alone Saturday night and all day Sunday, and then leave the candidate to find his own way to the department for the first appointment on Monday. This will help insure a nice weekend free of obligations for members of the department, but it certainly doesn't impress your candidate, especially if you are trying to convince him that your university is the perfect place to start his career.

**6. Put your most cantankerous faculty member in charge of hosting the candidate during an on campus visit.** This is almost a given for any failed search. The faculty member will air all the department's dirty laundry, probably offend the candidate at some point during the visit, and inform the candidate that the senior faculty never promote or tenure anyone. What a way to build the image and reputation of the department.

**7. Set the itinerary for the campus visit with meetings scheduled for each faculty at times when individual faculty are unavailable.** This will ensure that the candidate knows how busy faculty are and how inconvenient it is for them to talk to anyone, including the candidate. When rescheduling the appointment, be sure that your colleagues intimidate the candidate during the one-on-one conversation with esoteric and off-the-wall questions. This helps render the interviewee speechless and dazed for the rest of the visit, and enables faculty to opine that the candidate knows nothing about the discipline or their specialties.

**8. Make sure that the room for the talk has no audio-visual equipment, or if it does, make sure it isn't working properly.** The idea here is to make the presenter as nervous as possible. Faulty overhead projectors, jammed slide projectors, or inoperable powerpoint presentations should assure this. There's no need to test the equipment before hand, since the audience really does like to see the candidate squirm.

**9. Once the interview is over, take months to reimburse the candidate's expenses.** Not only will this help the candidate to understand the bureaucracy of your university, it will keep your departmental budget in the black a little longer.

**10. Last, but certainly not least, never let the unsuccessful candidates who visited your campus know they weren't hired.** This will save you considerable correspondence. You won't have to send rejection letters to long-listed or short-listed candidates. It will also enable you to string a candidate along for as long as possible and feel a sense of power over someone's future.

If you follow this ten-step program, I assure you that your pool of candidates and the ultimate success of your search will be just what you wanted--incomplete, inadequate, and unacceptable. Unfortunately, all of these examples have a ring of truth and happened in some form to many of the brightest and most energetic colleagues in our field. Do your experiences fall into one of these categories? I would welcome additions to my collection of rules on how not to run a job search. Send them to Department of Geography, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208. Voice 803- 777-5236. Fax 803777-4972. Internet scutter@sc.edu

APPENDIX 2.1

**Department of Geology and Geography  
Peer Review of Teaching**

Faculty Member \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Course number and section \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Observation: \_\_\_\_\_

**For each statement, mark the box that best reflects the teacher’s teaching. DO NOT MARK BETWEEN THE BOXES. If you do not observe a particular behavior or are unqualified to make an informed judgment, then you should mark NA.**

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>CONTENT:</b>						
1. Content of the lecture reflects current knowledge of the discipline.						
2. Intellectual level of the course is appropriate for the enrolled students.						
3. When appropriate, a distinction was made between facts and opinions.						

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>PRESENTATION:</b>						
1. Presentation is clear and well organized.						
2. Instructor is well prepared.						
3. Instructor relates various topics of the course to each other.						-
4. Instructor emphasizes relevance, interconnections, and/or applications of material presented.						
5. Instructor spoke clearly and at an appropriate volume.						
6. The material is presented at the right pace.						
7. Instructor uses easy to understand examples to explain abstract ideas.						
8. Instructor effectively uses visual aids.						
9. Instructor shows interest and enthusiasm in material he/she is teaching.						
10. Instructor gives clear instructions for assignments.						
11. If needed, instructor handles classroom disruptions effectively.						

**Strongly Disagree    Disagree    Neither Agree nor Disagree    Agree    Strongly Agree    NA**

**INTERACTION:**

1. Instructor holds student attention.
2. Instructor encourages students to participate and ask questions.
3. Instructor provides clear answers to student questions.
4. Instructor attempts to stimulate critical thinking among students.
5. Instructor uses eye contact effectively.
6. Instructor treats students fairly.

**For the purposes of quantification:**  
**Strongly Disagree = 1    Disagree = 2    Neither Agree no Disagree = 3    Agree = 4**  
**Strongly Agree = 5.**

**Comments are often the most helpful part of peer review, especially when activities require context and the results are multilayered. Where appropriate, please comment on the active learning environment. Please provide a summary evaluation. Attach separate sheet(s) if necessary.**

**Comments:**

## APPENDIX 2.2

**ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY  
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**

## ANNUAL FACULTY REVIEW

For The Period January 1, \_\_\_\_\_ to December 31, \_\_\_\_\_

The review of faculty members is to be conducted annually by the appropriate administrator. Copies of the Review are to be filed in the office of the department/unit head and the dean.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title and Rank: \_\_\_\_\_

Department/Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

**I. SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES  
(To be prepared by faculty member)****A. TEACHING****1. Evidence of quality instruction**

The faculty member must provide material describing his/her teaching activities and documentation supporting effectiveness. This material could include any of the following, or any other items deemed appropriate: student ratings of instruction, measures of student success, peer reviews, department chair review, recognition of outstanding teaching, developmental activities, self evaluations of courses taught, instructional materials used, course outline or syllabi, test materials and/or other materials.

**2. Research Supervision**

The faculty member should list activities pertaining to advising of graduate students in terms of guidance provided for a master's thesis, doctoral dissertation, etc. He/she should also include any activity for mentoring undergraduate students working on individual or group research projects. The information provided should include (but not be limited to) the following:

- a. number of such students
- b. average time spent on such activities per week
- c. any supporting documents (reports etc.) as a testimonial of such endeavors.

**3. Courses initiated/innovations instituted/other teaching contributions**

(Include new courses initiated, special lectures in other courses, generation of teaching aids, activities supportive of teaching, student achievements, other)

**4. Professional Development****5. Other**

**B. SERVICE**

1. Public service, as lectures, short courses, workshops presented. Indicate dates, organizations, and places; Off campus/on campus/extension projects:
2. Advising (undergraduate), advisor to student organizations:
3. Professional association service (offices held, journals edited, tasks performed, etc.):
4. Service grants: submitted or awarded (cite source, title of project, role, \$ amount, dates):
5. University service (committees, administrative accomplishments, etc.):
6. School/departmental service/committees, etc.:
7. Professional development:
8. Other:

**C. SCHOLARSHIP**

1. Publications, performance or creative activities. For books, indicate date of publication and publisher; for articles, indicate refereed journals and pages; for reports, indicate those done for in-house use.
2. Professional papers read: indicated whether invited, refereed, or volunteered. City, organization, date, and title:
3. Grants for research or study: submitted or awarded (cite source, title of project, role, [PI, etc.], \$ amount, dates):
4. Professional development:
5. Other:

## II. EVALUATION BY UNIT HEAD, DEAN OR DIRECTOR

The annual performance review is based upon the agreement concerning goals and objectives, responsibilities, expectations, and achievements of the faculty. A faculty member would normally be expected to have an assignment in teaching, service and scholarship. Indicate assignment below:

A. Assignment: Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_%; Service: \_\_\_\_\_%; Scholarship: \_\_\_\_\_%;  
(Total = 100%)

B. Rate the performance of the faculty member in each category on a scale of 1 to 5 in accordance with the rating standard below:

### **TEACHING**

1    2    3    4    5    Not Applicable

1. **Unsatisfactory**. Quality and quantity of work are totally unacceptable. Some examples include: (a) frequently does not meet classes, (b) does not conduct office hours, (c) receives very poor teaching evaluations. Immediate corrective action imperative.
2. **Needs Improvement**. Work is unsatisfactory in quantity and quality, individual is not performing at an adequate level. Some examples include: (a) commonly unprepared for classes, (b) seldom conducts office hours, (c) consistently receives mediocre teaching evaluations. Corrective action required.
3. **Satisfactory**. Quantity and quality of work are being performed at an adequate level according to departmental guidelines. Tasks and goals are being accomplished in a timely and competent manner.
4. **Good**. Quality and quantity of work exceed satisfactory level: goals often exceeded; productive. Some examples include: (a) conducts classes with imagination and enthusiasm, (b) introduces new developments into his/her courses, (c) recognized by students and colleagues as a good teacher.
5. **Excellent**. The faculty member is considered to be one of the best by students and colleagues. She/he meets and consistently exceeds the criteria for a rating of "good". An example follows: recognition beyond the unit that includes college, university, region, state, national and/or international recognition resulting from meritorious accomplishments.

### **SERVICE:**

1    2    3    4    5    Not Applicable

1. **Unsatisfactory**. Quality and quantity of work are totally unacceptable. An example follows: performs no service activities in general, and reluctantly, if any. Corrective action imperative.
2. **Needs Improvement**. Work is unsatisfactory in quantity and quality, individual is not performing at an adequate level. An example follows: serves on committees to which he/she is appointed but makes no special effort to carry out assigned charges. Corrective action required.
3. **Satisfactory**. Quality and quantity of work are being performed at an adequate level according to departmental guidelines. Tasks and goals are being accomplished in a timely and competent manner.

4. Good. Quality and quantity of work exceed satisfactory level: goals often exceeded; productive. Some examples include: (a) considered very effective in department, college, and/or university service activities, (b) selected to work on important programs at the department, college, university level, and/or external service activities, (c) selected to chair important committees at the department, college, and/or university level.
5. Excellent. The faculty member meets the requirements for a rating of “good” and has additional accomplishments. An example follows: uses professional expertise and skills to perform uncompensated service directed toward improving the quality of life for the local, state, national, and/or international community or to serve the academic community.

**SCHOLARSHIP:**

1   2   3   4   5   Not Applicable

1. Unsatisfactory. Quality and quantity of work are totally unacceptable. An example: a faculty member shows no interest in his/her discipline, does not participate in relevant activities to keep current in the field, other than that required for class preparation. Corrective action imperative.
2. Needs Improvement. Work is unsatisfactory in quality and quantity, individual not performing at adequate level. An example: a faculty member shows little enthusiasm and seldom participates in professional events such as lectures, symposia, etc. in order to keep current in the field. Corrective action required.
3. Satisfactory. Quantity and quality of work are being performed at an adequate level according to departmental guidelines. Tasks and goals are being accomplished in a timely and competent manner.
4. Good. Quality and quantity of work exceed satisfactory level: goals are often exceeded; productive. An example: a faculty member who (a) keeps current in his/her field through attendance and presentation of papers at professional meetings or other appropriate means, (b) carries out scholarly activities that are appropriate for his or her discipline and department.
5. Excellent. Individual meets the requirements for a rating of “good” and has additional accomplishments. An example: a faculty member who has earned recognition at the state, national and/or international level as an outstanding person contributing to the profession.

C. Narrative assessment of performance:

### III. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PAST PERFORMANCE/GOALS/ OBJECTIVES/RESPONSIBILITIES/EXPECTATIONS

On an annual basis, each faculty member and each unit head will agree in writing to the faculty member's goals, objectives, responsibilities and expectations. These may change during an academic year due to mutual agreement. Such changes are approved by the unit head and the faculty member.

#### JOB DESCRIPTION

Teaching: \_\_\_\_\_%; Service: \_\_\_\_\_%; Scholarship: \_\_\_\_\_%.  
(Total = 100%)

#### GOALS

Indicate specific goals and objectives for the coming year. (To be completed by faculty member).

WRITTEN COMMENTS BY UNIT HEAD, DEAN OR DIRECTOR

To be completed following the annual review meeting with the faculty member, but made available to the faculty member for review before signing by both parties. (Include such items as specific strengths, needs for improvement, responsibilities, and expectations for next year. Progress toward tenure and/or promotion will also be indicated here.)

IV. OVERALL RATING BY UNIT HEAD, DEAN OR DIRECTOR

1            2            3            4            5

Faculty Member: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Unit Head: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Dean: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

APPENDIX 2.3

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE FORM

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

A Unit of the University System of Georgia

Recommendation for Tenure  
Effective Fall 2005

I. Name \_\_\_\_\_ Social Security # \_\_\_\_\_  
First Middle Last Other

Rank and Title \_\_\_\_\_

Also Recommended for Promotion for 2005-2006?  Yes  No Years at Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Probationary Credit Granted \_\_\_\_\_ Years at Institution at Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher \_\_\_\_\_

Degrees \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

II. Summary of the action of Tenure Review Committee(s) and/or the recommendations submitted at the various levels within the institution pertaining to this individual's recommendation for tenure.

A. At the departmental/school level: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Unit Head/Date

B. At the college level: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Dean/Date

C. At the institution level: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Provost/Date

GEORGIA SOUTHERN  
UNIVERSITY

Tenure Recommendation for \_\_\_\_\_

**III. Brief description of the academic accomplishments of the faculty member.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Unit Head/Date

VPAA Form – Revised 06/17/04