

**Department of Earth Sciences**

**University of Connecticut**

# **BYLAWS**

**Adopted June 30, 2020**

**Revised October 16, 2020**

**Revised March 25, 2022**

## Table of Contents

<b>I - Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
A. Preamble .....	3
B. Mission .....	3
C. Purpose.....	3
D. Revision and Suspension of Bylaws .....	4
<b>II - Administrative Structure</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A. Head .....	4
B. Associate Department Head .....	5
C. Standing Committees .....	6
D. Ad Hoc Committees.....	6
E. Task Coordinators .....	6
<b>III - Faculty Responsibilities</b> .....	<b>6</b>
A. Membership.....	6
B. Voting Eligible Faculty.....	7
C. Secondary Appointments .....	7
D. General Responsibilities.....	7
E. Department Meetings .....	8
1. <i>Participants</i> : .....	8
2. <i>Schedule</i> :.....	8
3. <i>Notice and Agenda</i> :.....	8
4. <i>Procedures</i> .....	8
5. <i>Decisions</i> .....	8
<b>IV - Department Committees</b> .....	<b>9</b>
A. Standing Committees .....	9
1. <i>The Graduate Committee (GC)</i> .....	9
2. <i>The Undergraduate Committee (UC)</i> .....	10
3. <i>The Courses and Curriculum Committee (C&amp;C)</i> .....	10
4. <i>The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (DEI)</i> .....	11
5. <i>The Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR) Committee</i> .....	11
6. <i>Merit Advisory Committee</i> .....	11
B. Ad Hoc Committees .....	12
1. <i>Search Committees</i> .....	12
2. <i>Other Committees</i> .....	12
<b>V - Departmental Tasks</b> .....	<b>12</b>
A. Standing Tasks .....	12
<i>Website Manager</i> .....	12
<i>Seminar/Colloquia</i> .....	12
<i>Space, Facilities, and Equipment</i> .....	13
<i>Alumni &amp; Development</i> .....	13
<i>Outreach and Scholarly Engagement</i> .....	13
<i>Awards</i> .....	13
<i>Honors Advisor</i> .....	13
<i>Delegate to College/ University/ State Committees</i> .....	14
2. Ad Hoc Tasks .....	14
<b>VI - Grievance</b> .....	<b>14</b>

# Bylaws, Department of Earth Sciences

---

## I - Introduction

### **A. Preamble**

The Earth Sciences are a range of STEM disciplines that examine the whole Earth system through deep time, encompassing its solid, liquid, gaseous, organic, and human components. Earth science expertise provides the societal context needed to meet the economic, environmental, health, safety, and other global challenges of our time, now that humans have become the dominant geologic agency operating on the planetary surface during the Anthropocene Epoch.

By adopting these bylaws, the individual faculty of the Department of Earth Sciences at the University of Connecticut affirm their commitment to shared governance based on core values of collegiality, democracy, transparency, diversity, inclusion, and equitable workload sharing. As the policy-making body of the Department, the faculty will function as a Committee of the Whole, seeking consensus whenever possible to oversee our missions of teaching, research, service, and scholarly engagement. We pledge to interact with respect and civility, while building a respectful and enjoyable departmental culture for students, staff, faculty, and others.

A department's focus is on the team. Individuals will vary in different years and in different career stages in the relative emphasis they place on research, teaching, service, leadership, and scholarly engagement, all of which are vital to our mission. A general attitude will be promulgated that everyone's work is valued. As a bonded group, the successes and failures of individuals translate to the team.

### **B. Mission**

The mission of the Department of Earth Sciences (ERTH) is to provide quality instructional programs and research opportunities at the graduate and undergraduate levels and to support scientific research and scholarly engagement that advances the understanding of Earth system processes and makes that understanding useful to society.

### **C. Purpose**

The purpose of these bylaws is to provide the framework and guidelines for departmental operation and governance. They define the roles and functions of departmental leadership,

administration, committees, and tasks. Departmental policies and procedures are explained in a separate Departmental Handbook. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between Departmental guidelines and procedures and the Laws and Bylaws of College and University, and/or any specific provisions of any collective bargaining agreement, the College and University Bylaws and/or the collective bargaining agreement shall prevail.

These by-laws comply with the broader [University Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities](#):

The faculty constitute a community of scholars. The vitality of that community arises not just from individual continuing scholarly achievement, but depends as well upon the quality and quantity of collegial interactions and contributions to the mission of that community. Individually, faculty members are expected to engage in research and other scholarly activities, to teach, and to perform service... every faculty member is expected to contribute to the shared responsibilities that support the varied educational mission at the department, college/school, and university level.

This university policy is linked to the [Guidelines and Procedures](#) policy of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, which requires that every department "maintain a Professional Responsibilities Document." For the purposes of these bylaws, this requirement is met in our Department Handbook.

## **D. Revision and Suspension of Bylaws**

These bylaws constitute a living document, to be updated as needed using the procedure required for all faculty decisions clarified in section III E of this document, which requires a majority vote of voting-eligible faculty, including currently tenured, tenure-track, in-residence, and research faculty. Bylaws will be reviewed on an annual basis. New amendments will be proposed by any voting-eligible faculty, and then either adopted or rejected by faculty consensus/vote.

The Bylaws may be suspended temporarily under unusual circumstances (i.e., emergency situations). Because of the serious nature of this procedure, three-fourths (3/4) of the voting Faculty must support this action.

# II - Administrative Structure

## **A. Head**

### 1. Duties:

- a. Act as Chief Executive Officer.
- b. Supervise Departmental staff.
- c. Oversee, with budgetary authority, spending of all Departmental accounts, including Operating, Academic Materials, Summer/Winter Session revenue,

Xerox, IDC, and others not specified, based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook.

- d. Oversee, with budgetary authority, distribution of funds in Foundation accounts.
- e. Assign faculty teaching: following guidelines set by The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) in conjunction with incentives established by its strategic plan; based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook; and after consultation with the Heads of other departments as warranted and required by faculty memoranda of understanding (MOUs) and/or for cross-listing of courses.
- f. Assign faculty service (committees and tasks) based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook.
- g. Oversee the Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment process based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook.
- h. Administer Merit allocations in consultation with the Merit Advisory Committee based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook.
- i. Evaluate and allocate Departmental space for offices and research based on procedures outlined in the Department Handbook.
- j. Hold regular faculty meetings based on procedures outlined in this document.
- k. Oversee hiring of faculty and staff.
- l. Oversee teaching and research collections.
- m. Attend the Department Head meetings scheduled by CLAS and the Provost's Office, and other administrative meetings, and report back to faculty.
- n. Mentor faculty and staff.
- o. Represent the department at University/public functions.
- p. Be regularly available for consultations and advocacy as needed by faculty and staff.
- q. Help adjudicate conflicts between faculty and staff.

2. Selection and Review Procedures. The Head is appointed by the Dean of CLAS and reviewed following procedures outlined in the [CLAS Guidelines and Procedures](#).

## **B. Associate Department Head**

1. Duties: Duties include performing the Head's duties in the Head's absence. Other duties will be determined in consultation with the Head, and will vary depending on interest and expertise. Performs the role filled by the Department Advisory Committee in larger departments, which is to advise the Head.
2. Selection Procedure: The Associate Head is appointed by the Head.
3. Term: Annual and renewable, with no set term limit.

### **C. Standing Committees**

1. Standing committees include the Graduate Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, the Courses and Curriculum Committee (C&C), the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusivity Committee, the Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee (PTR), and the Merit Advisory Committee.
2. Committees consist of a Chair and additional members as specified in the bylaws. Chairs and members are appointed by the Head after requests and/or nominations from individual faculty are considered.
3. Committees meet at least once per semester during the academic year, with additional meetings as necessary. Committee membership incurs an obligation to attend meetings and be actively involved in performing stated goals. Individual contributions to committees will be officially self-reported during the annual review/merit process, and informally reported by committee chairs during department meetings and as needed.
4. The duties of each standing committee are detailed below.

### **D. Ad Hoc Committees**

Ad hoc committees of any size may be created and charged at any time at the discretion of the Head. Some, like search committees, are recurrent. Others are one-time only.

### **E. Task Coordinators**

Tasks and other duties not assigned to a committee will be assigned to a coordinator by the Head following requests and/or nominations from individual faculty. The designation "Task Coordinator" is comparable in service commitment to committee chair. Current tasks assigned to a coordinator are listed in Section IV below. The Head may assign additional tasks and appoint coordinators as needed.

## **III - Faculty Responsibilities**

### **A. Membership**

As defined in the UConn Bylaws, the faculty of a Department are "*all full-time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors...regardless of campus.*"

## **B. Voting Eligible Faculty**

All faculty with a Primary (PTR/merit home) appointment in EARTH are eligible to vote on all departmental initiatives. Faculty members with a Secondary Joint appointment in Earth Sciences may be granted rights to weigh in on consensus-based decisions or vote by a majority vote of faculty with Primary appointments in EARTH. Voting rights cannot be extended on matters related to PTR, Merit, or the revision of departmental bylaws and policies outlined in the Department Handbook (see also the Provost's [Guidelines on Secondary Appointments](#)).

## **C. Secondary Appointments**

When the department wishes to extend secondary membership to a UConn faculty member whose regular membership (merit home) is in another department, the Department Head and CLAS Dean may recommend to the Provost a secondary appointment with the same professional title. Secondary appointments are considered Joint when PTR and Merit involve both departments as specified in a MOU, Affiliate when these activities are voluntary by the secondary department, and Courtesy when a non-UConn employee is appointed. This process is governed by the Provost's [Guidelines on Secondary Appointments](#), which specifies MOU requirements. Courtesy appointments must involve a broad benefit to the department, and require approval by the faculty.

## **D. General Responsibilities**

These bylaws are based on the assumption that individual faculty have read the University's [Policy on Faculty Professional Responsibilities](#) located at <https://policy.uconn.edu/2011/05/26/faculty-professional-responsibilities-policy-on/>.

Selected quotes especially relevant to EARTH include:

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to produce specific evidence of strong performance in both scholarship (in the form of research, other intellectual contributions and artistic activities) and teaching. In addition, service and outreach activities are valued and expected of all faculty members.

The education of students in a research university goes beyond the formal acquisition of knowledge and the critical assessment of that knowledge to include skills and training in the methods of generating knowledge.

The department head is charged with setting an appropriate distribution of responsibilities for individual faculty that reflects that member's particular strengths, the nature of his/her obligation to the University, and the needs of the academic unit.

Annual meetings will be held between the department head and individual faculty. The department head will review and discuss the faculty member's productivity and present and future professional activities.

Faculty are also expected to participate in advising undergraduate majors and minors, especially with respect to the BA vs. B.S. degree, the undergraduate major tracks (Earth, Atmospheres, Environmental Geoscience), and the double major.

## **E. Department Meetings**

Participating in department meetings is an essential part of team responsibilities, especially for faculty.

### **1. Participants:**

Faculty (primary, joint, research, affiliate, and courtesy), Staff, Undergraduate and Graduate student representatives, and guests. Non-voting participants may be excluded for executive sessions. Faculty and the student representatives (or designees) are expected at regular department meetings.

### **2. Schedule:**

During the academic year regular (or routine) department meetings (in-person or virtual) are held at least monthly at a regular day/time selected at the start of the semester by a majority of faculty. Special (or ad hoc) meetings may be called as needed. If decisions must be made between official meetings, this may be done via electronic communication under the supervision of the Head.

### **3. Notice and Agenda:**

Notices and/or reminders of upcoming meetings with a call for agenda items will be sent with sufficient notice before every meeting. The Head sets the agenda, and will distribute it to all attendees before the meeting.

### **4. Procedures**

The Head, as presiding officer, will run and end meetings in such a way that everyone can contribute as warranted. For reaching decisions, the Head will use an informal version of Roberts Rules of Order: establishing that a quorum of half or more voting members are present, asking for motions and seconds, moderating discussions, asking for consensus/a vote (as appropriate), and announcing the results.

### **5. Decisions**

All decisions made by the department, which operates as a committee of the whole, will be made by consensus if reached, and by a majority vote if necessary. Votes will generally take place during meetings, but may be done by email or online when necessary. Initially, the Head will not vote. If votes end with a tie, the Head will cast the deciding vote.



Matters of substance (policy) proposed by the chairs of standing and ad hoc committees and task coordinators are generally subject to faculty approval. PTR and Merit committees, however, work by their own rules, subject to oversight by the faculty.

#### **6. Minutes and reports.**

Minutes of faculty meetings are recorded and posted soon after the meeting. Corrections to the minutes can be made at the next regular faculty meeting.

## **IV - Department Committees**

Department committees are groups of faculty usually appointed by the Head, and always to accomplish some goal. They divide into standing committees and ad-hoc committees. The former persist on a year-to-year basis to handle affairs common to all academic departments. The latter are appointed to meet short-term goals (e.g., search committees) or to meet requests for proposals.

### **A. Standing Committees**

The composition and activities of standing committees in Geosciences appear below. In general, the Graduate Committee, Undergraduate Committee, the Courses and Curriculum Committee are expected to have three members (including the committee chair) appointed by the Head, with one rotating off every year after a three-year term. However, the number of committee members may vary; for example; the DEI committee warrants broader representation, and additional members to some committees may be assigned in response to unusually heavy workloads (e.g., major overhauls that do not recur every year) or sabbaticals. Members may serve extended terms if interested, warranted, and approved by the Head. These committees are expected to report at regular faculty meetings. If the reports are too lengthy, advance notice is required to modify the agenda.

#### **1. The Graduate Committee (GC)**

The GC is chaired by the Graduate Coordinator, who is also normally the Geosciences Field of Study representative to the Graduate School. Members must be part of the graduate faculty.

Charges to the committee include: initial screening of applications to the Graduate Program; creating opportunities for faculty input to the admissions process; recommendations of candidates for admission; advising the Head for filling Research Assistant and Teaching Assistant positions; advising the Curriculum and Courses Committee of any curriculum needs for graduate students; advising the Head on the content and staffing of the graduate Core Course or alternative; providing oversight of the degree progress of the graduate students in the department; maintaining a manual for explaining our rules and expectations for progress toward degree completion, doing an annual evaluation of the department's graduate program in the context of the strategic plans and initiatives for the department, college, and university. The committee will also administer and analyze annual surveys of

incoming, continuing and graduating students and maintain current records on each student in the program. Additional charges may be made at the discretion of the Head.

## **2. The Undergraduate Committee (UC)**

The UC is chaired by the Undergraduate Coordinator, and will work closely with our departmental advisor (Program Coordinator).

The committee is charged with overseeing the educational experiences of all Geoscience undergraduate students. Activities will be determined by the current needs of the department. Responsibilities include: promotion of, and recruitment to, the Geosciences major (B.S. and B.A. as a first, second, or interdisciplinary major) and minor at the main and regional campuses; helping to coordinate advising within the department, being a liaison for advisors in other programs on campus, notably ACES and the CLAS Advising Center; bringing curricula needs to the Curriculum & Course Committee; monitoring activities of the GeoClub; organizing and hosting events to enhance the undergraduate experience, including the regularly scheduled open houses, the majors fair; and others; evaluating the department's undergraduate program in the context of the department, college and university strategic plans and initiatives; enhancing and marketing the visibility and accessibility of our undergraduate courses, majors, and minors at the main and regional campuses; coordinating with the UConn Center for Career Development; enhancing the diversity and inclusion of under-represented groups; assisting with transfer admissions; and nominating current students for various awards and scholarships.

## **3. The Courses and Curriculum Committee (C&C)**

The C&C Committee is chaired by the C&C Coordinator.

Responsibilities include: assessing the relevance, quality, and semester-by-semester scheduling of undergraduate and graduate courses within the context of peer and aspirant geoscience programs; planning for changing curriculum needs based on trends in the discipline and the CLAS strategic plan; and soliciting proposals for new courses. The committee will evaluate proposals for new courses or for significant changes (by the standards of the registrar) to existing courses. One member of the C&C Committee (normally the chair) should be our delegate to the CLAS C&C Committee, whose responsibilities are to help with the CAR (Course Action Request) process, attend the regular CLAS C&C meetings, and report back to geoscience faculty. Additional charges to the EARTH C&C Committee may be made at the discretion of the Head.

#### **4 The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (DEI)**

This committee is charged with ensuring that we create and maintain a diverse, equitable, and inclusive community. Membership is appointed by the Head. The committee includes representation by graduate and undergraduate students who are appointed after an application and review process.

#### **5. The Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR) Committee**

The PTR committee and its Chair are appointed by the Head based on rules described below.

The PTR Committee is charged with evaluating the dossiers of all: tenure-system faculty who are in the pre-tenure period and/or being considered for promotion; and in-residence faculty being considered for multi-year appointments. The committee follows procedures described by the [Provost's Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment](#) guidelines and the AAUP collective bargaining agreement. The committee advises the Head on each candidate's qualifications for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and/or multi-year appointment. The PTR Committee for Tenure System faculty includes all members who have achieved the rank or tenure status (or higher) for which a candidate is being considered. The committee may be reduced in size down to 3 members for evaluating in-residence faculty. The department's PTR procedures are described in the Department Handbook.

#### **6. Merit Advisory Committee**

The Merit Advisory Committee consists of four members, three of whom are elected by the faculty with the provision that the committee not contain spouses. Each elected member serves for three years, with one member rotating off each year. The committee member who is in the final year of their three-year term will serve as the Chair. The fourth member is appointed for a single-year term by the Head to help balance representation.

The Merit Advisory Committee is charged with examining the annual reports of all faculty members as part of a single pool, and evaluating their performance using procedures outlined in the Department Handbook. All evaluations (except those of the Head) are reported to the Head, who compiles them, finalizes the compilation with the Merit Committee, reports back to individual faculty, and provides recommendations to the dean and, in cases of joint appointments, to relevant department heads. The committee makes a recommendation for the Head directly to the dean. Merit is distributed in accordance with the guidelines set down in the AAUP contract. The Department's specific procedures are detailed in the Department Handbook.

## **B. Ad Hoc Committees**

Ad hoc Committees of variable size are appointed by the head as needed, whenever a challenge arises that requires more than one faculty member (e.g., a search committee).

### **1. Search Committees**

Policies and processes for search committees are set by the university and depend on the position being filled. A committee is charged with selecting the best candidate(s) for a position. To the extent possible, the search committee will act in the interests of the whole department.

### **2. Other Committees**

Members are appointed by the Head, and the processes followed by the committee depend on the task being addressed. The general charge to each committee is to finish the task and report to the faculty. One example is the "Field Trip Committee."

## **V - Departmental Tasks**

Tasks are departmental service activities assigned by the Head to individuals rather than to committees. Standing tasks continue year-by-year, whereas ad-hoc tasks are short-term, usually less than a semester. Faculty assigned to departmental tasks are called coordinators. Procedures are described in the Department Handbook.

### **A. Standing Tasks**

Standing tasks are normally assigned a coordinator as part of service loads. Some tasks may not be assigned a coordinator for some semesters if faculty capacity is not available.

#### **Website Manager**

The charge is to monitor, improve, update, and maintain the department's website to the level of accessibility set by the college. This includes regular updates and news feeds. Decisions about the design and content of the website is retained by the voting-eligible faculty.

#### **Seminar/Colloquia**

The charge is to plan and coordinate the department's seminar/colloquia and related events in conjunction with the Teale Lecture Series and other related series or special events, for example Earth Day. Specifically: to solicit faculty for potential speakers;

canvass organizations for sponsored speakers; coordinate with Staff on travel/accommodation; arrange for a host; and coordinate the schedule for the visit.

### **Space, Facilities, and Equipment**

The charge is to assist the Head in evaluating and planning departmental space, facilities and equipment use consistent with the policies outlined in the Department Handbook. Specifically: to work with the faculty to maximize best management practices for common departmental space and individual lab spaces; be the principal secondary contact for UConn's Facilities & Operations with respect to assignments/repairs/renovations/inventories of space in Beach Hall (and elsewhere); liaison with CLAS and University space committees to maximize our advantage. This task also tracks the location and condition of shared lab and field equipment and computers and devices.

### **Alumni & Development**

The charge is to assist the Head in developing and communicating with an EARTH advisory board, our alumni, and the UConn Foundation. Specifically: to maintain regular contact with alumni at least once per semester and to link this information with the EARTH website manager.

### **Outreach and Scholarly Engagement**

The charge is to assist the Head in representing and providing information about the activities of the department to the public. Specifically: to coordinate the department's social media presence; work with University Communications to spread the good word about geosciences.

### **Awards**

The charge is to nominate members of the EARTH-community (faculty, staff, students, alumni, others) for awards and honors, including those internal to the department, the college, the university, and beyond.

### **Honors Advisor**

The charge is to be the department's representative to the University-wide Honors Program. Specifically: to be the official honors advisor for all honors students majoring in Geosciences, a task that is separate from that of faculty advisor; attend honors events as needed (e.g., orientations, open houses, ceremonies and special events); and to serve on honors committees.

### **Delegate to College/University/State Committees**

The charge is to ensure that EARTH is represented on standing and ad hoc committees of CLAS and the University, many of which are constituency based. Examples include the University Senate, Senate sub-committees, the Dean's PTR Advisory Committee, the Board of Directors of the Connecticut State Museum of Natural History, and others. Delegates will either be appointed or elected, depending on the position.

## **2. Ad Hoc Tasks**

Ad hoc task coordinators are appointed by the head as needed whenever a challenge arises that requires only one faculty member. An example is coordinating a survey for visioning a department future.

## **VI - Grievance**

Grievance procedures for faculty are as set forth in Section XIV of the By-Laws of the University of Connecticut and the AAUP collective bargaining contract under the heading [The Grievance Process](#). In this process, the Department Head falls under the label "administration." Details can be found at <https://uconnaaup.org/resources/grievances/>.

## PERFORMANCE REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN EARTH

---

All faculty are required to undergo an annual Performance Review. The purpose of the Performance Review is to promote, maintain, and enhance excellence in job performance and to foster informed communication between bargaining unit members and their supervisor. The guiding principles are as follows:

1. The Performance Review shall be based upon each bargaining unit member's assigned duties in teaching, service, research, and/or clinical work, including duties associated with extension and any administrative appointment held by the member.
2. The Performance Review should clarify or establish the faculty member's assigned duties in teaching, service, research, clinical work, and/or extension for the next year.
3. The Performance Review is an opportunity for faculty members and their supervisors to discuss a faculty member's ambitions and aspirations within the University and the profession, including teaching preferences and progress toward promotion.

The Department of Earth Sciences has four categories of faculty relevant to this policy.

### **Research Faculty (non-tenure system)**

This category of faculty is fully funded by grants. The supervisor, typically the PI, is responsible for ensuring that annual Performance Reviews are carried out, whether using the form proposed here or another approach adopted by the PI. Copies of review documents shall be retained by the supervisor. The supervisor must ensure that the Head is notified when reviews are completed.

### **In-Residence Faculty (non-tenure system)**

These are faculty who are specifically employed to meet the teaching needs of the department. Performance reviews of In-Residence faculty shall be carried out by the Head.

### **Joint Faculty with tenure homes elsewhere**

Performance Reviews shall be carried out by the Head of tenure-home units, following policies and procedures established by that unit.

### **Faculty with tenure homes in EARTH**

Performance Reviews of faculty with tenure homes in EARTH shall be carried out by the Head.

### **Procedures**

Each year, the Head, or in the case of Research Faculty, the supervisor, shall provide a written summary to the faculty member. At a minimum, the summary shall:

1. State the faculty member's anticipated workload for the next academic year;
2. Provide formative feedback in the performance review commenting upon their performance in each area of assigned duties (research, teaching, service, extension, and/or clinical work).
3. Conclude whether the faculty member's performance is "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory."

Written summaries will be treated as confidential between the Head and the faculty member. They will not be used in making decisions about merit, reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Copies will be archived by the department in a secure location. The Dean will be notified when Performance Reviews have been completed, but will not receive copies of the written summaries or an indication of their contents.

Faculty shall be given the opportunity to meet with the Head to discuss their performance before the Head completes the written summary. An Annual Report Form, appended below, which will also inform merit decisions, will be submitted by a deadline (early to mid-May), specified at least one month in advance by the Head. The exception to this rule will be for Research Faculty, whose performance will be reviewed on a schedule determined by their supervisor. Although the form contains sections for documenting research, teaching, and service, a faculty member need only complete the sections relevant to his or her assigned duties.

The Head shall base the written summary on the activities presented in each faculty member's Annual Report Form and information that arises from one-on-one performance review meetings with the Head (see above paragraph). To achieve a satisfactory grade for research, a faculty member whose assignments include research (i.e., tenure-system faculty) must demonstrate that they are performing at a level expected for them to remain research active. In cases where faculty deemed "partially research active" or "not research active" have been assigned higher teaching loads, the Head will expect to see evidence of research activity that is commensurate with revised workload assignments. In some cases, faculty may be working towards re-establishing their status as research active. In terms of teaching and service, a satisfactory rating will apply to faculty who have completed their teaching and service duties as assigned by the Head (see Faculty Workload Policies in EARTH). Satisfactory completion of teaching duties implies that a faculty member shows up on time and prepared for class meetings, is available to students for consultation, and provides regular, timely feedback to students. Satisfactory completion of service duties implies that a faculty member attends and actively contributes to committee work and other assigned duties.

### **Unsatisfactory Performance Review**

Supervisors are required to give a faculty member at least four (4) months' warning before issuing an unsatisfactory Performance Review. The warning shall trigger a meeting among the member, department head or supervisor, and appropriate representative of the UConn-AAUP, if requested, to develop a plan to achieve a satisfactory Performance Review. Failure to meet the standards enunciated in the plan shall be considered just cause for an unsatisfactory Performance Review. The member shall have the right to appeal any unsatisfactory Performance Review through the AAUP grievance procedure.



**Department of Earth Sciences**  
**Annual Report Form**  
 May 1, 2022 – April 30, 2023

**Name:**

**Distribution of Effort (select one):**

Tenure-system faculty:      Research 45%, Teaching 35%, Service 20%  
 In residence faculty:        Teaching 100%  
 Research faculty:            Research (100%)

<b>A. TEACHING</b>
--------------------

**REGULAR TEACHING** (List all combined 4000-5000 level sections on one line)

<u>Course #</u>	<u>Course name</u>	<u>Credit hrs.</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Lab</u> <u>(y/n)</u>	<u>Co-taught</u> <u>(y/n)</u>	<u>GA</u> <u>(y/n)</u>

**ADDITIONAL TEACHING** (Use this space to list activities such as replacement teaching for absent faculty, honors seminars, continuing education courses, lectures in other departments, short-course presentations, summer courses, and graduate seminars)

**CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT** (Include only *substantive modification* or *development of new courses*. **DO NOT** list normal course updates. You may include additional material to document curriculum development under separate cover)

**RESEARCH MENTORING**

**Postdoc supervision:**

Postdoc name              Project title              Funding Source

**Graduate degrees completed under my supervision:**

student name              degree, year              thesis title (abbr.)              Funding source

**Graduate committee assignments:**

student name            degree sought   entry date    supervisor (y/n) if y indicate funding source

**Undergraduate research supervision:**

student name            Project title            Pay or credit?            Comments

**UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISING**

Advising roles (departmental, programmatic, etc.)

student name            program/major

**TEACHING-RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

## B. RESEARCH

### **PUBLICATIONS**

**Published books, book chapters, or volumes**

**Published articles in peer-reviewed journals** (student authors in bold)

**Articles in press in peer-reviewed journals**

**Articles submitted and under review:**

**Published Conference Abstracts** (Indicate those you presented with an \*; student authors in bold).

### **FUNDING**

**Active grants and contracts during merit period** (please list funding agency, title, co-PIs, total amount, UConn share of total (if different) and duration for each award)

**Applications for funding** (please state if pending or unsuccessful)

### **OTHER RESEARCH-RELATED ACTIVITIES NOT LISTED ABOVE**

**Invited seminars:**

**Conference organization:**

**Conference Session Convenor or Co-Convenor:**

**Media coverage:**

**Professional Development:**

**Other:**

<b>C. SERVICE</b>
-------------------

**SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION**

**Responsibilities in professional societies (DO NOT include society membership)**

**Responsibilities for professional publications**

**Other service to the profession not listed above**

**SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT**

**University level service duties**

**College of Liberal Arts and Sciences service duties**

**Department of Earth Sciences – assigned duties**

**Department of Earth Sciences – other**

**SERVICE WITHIN PUBLIC ARENA**

**Outreach and engagement activities**

**OTHER EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL RECOGNITION**

**Prizes, awards, and honors**

#### **D. SELF-REFLECTION and FUTURE PLANS**

**You may use up to 2 pages to (1) reflect on the past year and (2) discuss your ambitions and aspirations within the University and the profession in the coming year, including teaching plans, service preferences, research plans, and progress towards promotion. You will be invited to meet with department head to discuss the contents of this narrative (optional).**

## MERIT REVIEW IN EARTH

---

### Purpose

A voluntary, annual review of merit provides a mechanism for distinguishing and rewarding truly meritorious activities by one or more of our colleagues as part of a process designed to be as democratic and transparent as possible. It's also a way for us to incentivize our group priorities because we – not the Dean or Provost – get to decide what constitutes performance above and beyond the rewarding routine of academic life.

The kinds of activities we deem meritorious, and the relative importance we give them, are decided by all faculty, for example the annual decision about the relative weights for research, teaching, and service.

### Basic Process & Definitions

**Provost's Definition:** "Meritorious performance is regarded as noteworthy contributions beyond being merely satisfactory, and is not expected that all members will qualify for such recognition." Thus merit is awarded only for work performance that is consistent with our shared values, and deemed above and beyond baseline expectations set by EARTH, CLAS, and University policies.

**Funding:** Typically, the Provost takes a percentage (exact amount varies) of the combined salaries of the unit, reserving 10% for special awards. The Dean reserves 20% for special awards (undefined), leaving 70% of the total for us to work with to make recommendations to the Dean. This is our *dollar pool*. Our dollar pool is divided into categories for Tenure-System Faculty, In-Residence Faculty, and Research Faculty.

**Pools:** Merit awards are given at three levels. The departmental pool is 70% of the salary reserve taken by the university for merit. The college's pool is currently 20%, and the provost's is 10%. Above and beyond this, the department head may make recommendations to the Dean or Provost for "special merit" at those levels for especially meritorious activities, but the decisions about such awards are not ours.

**Schedule:** Merit evaluations will be done near the end of Spring Semester but before the end of May, after which faculty with regular appointments have no departmental responsibilities.

**Evaluation Period:** The merit period in Earth Sciences is May 1-April 30. If a late-breaking achievement is not counted in a particular year, it may be counted for the next year – the key is to avoid counting any non-continuing activity twice.

**Committee Structure:** The committee consists of 4 faculty members. Three are elected by the faculty during an anonymous vote. The ballot is administered by the head and consists of faculty who agreed to serve after being nominated or self-nominated. A fourth member is appointed by the

head to ensure diversity on the committee (rank/ gender/ race/ ethnicity/ specialty/ disability/ career stage/ age/ etc.)

**Basis for Merit:** Merit is based entirely on (1) the EARTH Annual Report Form and (2) The Provost's Annual Report (Detailed) under the tab 'Rapid Reports' from HuskyDM.

## Principles & Values

Merit evaluations in the Department of Earth Sciences will be guided by the following principles and values in the background:

**Spectrum:** The meritorious activities of faculty vary widely across Scholarship, Teaching, and Service, and all are valued by all. The team is made stronger by a diversity of strengths across this spectrum.

**Relative Importance:** On the long term, our R1 (Tier 1 Research University) mission requires that the merit process weight research/scholarship more heavily than teaching and service. The relative weights given to teaching and service may vary each year.

**Snapshot:** Justification for merit is most easily understood as a 1-year-only snapshot of a full academic CV. For the purpose of evaluation, nothing is carried in from previous years except continuing appointments.

**Work Aggregate:** Merit assessment ultimately aggregates a host of disparate activities into a single number. It applies to the work accomplished, not the person doing the work, in the same way that a book review is about the book, not the author of the book.

**Positive:** Merit focuses only on what *is* being done, not on what *is not* being done, because it is for job performance above and beyond the basics.

**Special Achievement:** A truly singular achievement, meaning one unlikely to occur in any given year, should not diminish the awards of others, but should be isolated as a case for special achievement outside our merit pool by either the Dean or the Provost.

**Team Player:** The process allows reward for activities contributing to the combined productivity and success of the whole group in some meaningful way.

**Distribution Model:** Merit should not be distributed evenly, nor should it be skewed to just a few individuals at the high end.

**Minimize Bias:** Merit evaluation will strike a balance between subjective inference and quantitative data. We seek to minimize the unavoidable realities of implicit bias, confirmation bias, and deal-making, and to maximize the use of semi-quantitative metrics that involve personal judgments.

**No Binning:** Merit will not follow a "binning" process in which faculty are grouped based on levels of merit. Rather each is an individual on a continuous scale.

**Appeals:** Appeals are seen as constructive correctives, rather than complaints.

**Department Head:** He/she/they will play no role in assigning 90% of the merit pool. After the committee has finished its work, the remaining ~10% will be used at the Head's discretion. This 10% departmental pool is separate from the pool reserved at the Dean's or Provost's level for Special Merit.

## Differentiated Evaluations

**Head:** The *ERTH Department Head* is assigned merit by the Dean's office based on a system dictated by the Dean.

**Tenure System ERTH Faculty:** These will be evaluated by the merit process described below.

**Joint Faculty:** All joint faculty are governed by MOUs. Those with tenure homes outside ERTH are awarded merit in their primary home departments, and are not part of our committee's review/evaluation process. University policy requires that the ERTH Head contacts outside heads with relevant information. Those with primary appointments inside ERTH are treated the same as any other faculty by the Merit committee. University policy requires that the outside heads contribute relevant information.

**Administrative Leave:** Any of our faculty serving in administration outside the department will not be evaluated by our process. Nothing is required of us.

**Research Faculty:** Research faculty funded by grants are assigned merit through the Dean's Office and thereby excluded from our consideration.

**In-Residence Faculty** (non-tenure system/track, NTT): The award for In-Residence faculty is made solely by the Department Head with input from the Merit Advisory Committee, described later.

## Research

Judging research productivity involves weighing a number of factors that can vary from subfield to subfield; for example, counts of papers authored, dollars contracted, citations made, books published, collections built, or data bases created. The general rule is that more is better than less. But, more is not simply a question of quantity.

**A. Type -** Research productivity includes the publication record; grant activity; and presentations and participation in sessions organized at professional meetings and symposia. The publication record is generally the most important of these, especially articles and books vetted through the peer-review process. The expectations for grant activity are that, within the opportunities and constraints of funding in particular subfields, faculty should strive to make one substantive grant submission or have one substantive grant in force annually. For presentations, the expectations are



that all faculty members will make at least one major presentation each year at a national or international meeting.

**B. Quantity** - Generally, the more publications, grants (by number and size) and presentations in a given year, the higher the merit score. The quality and significance of the research accomplishments (e.g. quality of the journal, the source of grant funding)—not just quantity—must also be considered.

**C. Quality** - Peer-reviewed articles, grants, books, and other research products should be weighed more heavily in merit assessment. If a faculty member is an author of a book, the quality of the press as well as the reviews of the book will be taken into consideration in determining its merits.

**D. Placement** - Faculty should make every effort to make their research available to the largest and most relevant audiences at the local, national and international levels. The Merit Advisory Committee should consider that there are varying methods for rating journals such as impact factor; immediacy index; number of submissions and rejection rates for manuscripts; number of subscribers; size of publishing association; reputation of the publisher, editor or editorial board; and so forth. Increasingly, open-access publishing is changing the standards for academic publishing. In terms of grant funding, weight is given to the largest and most competitive agencies and foundations, such as NSF, NASA, DOE, NOAA, NIH, SCEC, Guggenheim, Fulbright, National Geographic, American Chemical Society, and others.

**E. Leadership** -- We tend to weight sole-authored, first-authored and lead PI projects more highly in our merit review system.

**F. Awards** -- Credit should be given when colleagues receive awards and special recognition for their research accomplishments.

## Teaching

Teaching involves course preparation and revision; curriculum development and design; recruiting, retaining, advising and mentoring students; staying abreast of new developments in the theory and practice of learning and teaching through workshops and other professional development opportunities

Advising and mentoring at both undergraduate and graduate levels is considered and recognized as part of teaching activities

**A. Commitment** – to updating and improving the quality of one’s own instruction

**B. Beyond Contractual** – Teaching . to help meet department needs

**C. Individualized Instruction** – As independent research, undergrad or grad, or advising.

**D. Exceptional Contributions** – New stuff, awards, curricula funding, etc.

## Service and Engagement

Service provides a record of commitment to the department, college, or university at the national or international level.

**A. Department, College, University** – Chair of major departmental committee (PTR, Undergraduate Coordinator, Merit, Search, etc.), Chair or active member of major college or university committee (Senate, C&C, College PTR, etc.) . Leadership role in interdisciplinary major program or research center/institute.

**B. Non-academic, local, state, national, international** – Significant public outreach through presentations and testimony, Work or research that result in presentations, reports, exhibitions, and other products not covered under research

**C. Academic Discipline** – Elected or appointed professional committees, reviewers, referees, panels, editors, etc.

## Merit Procedures

**Rubric and Weighting:** Early in the fall semester, the faculty will discuss, tweak, and approve a common numerical rubric to be used for merit in the coming year. Ideally the same basic form of this rubric will be used each year. This rubric will sum to a total of 100% based on subtotals for mandatory categories of Research, Teaching and Service, based on the requirement that the subtotal for research is the highest, and that all subtotals are at least 15%. The results of this poll will be reported at a faculty meeting, and used to generate merit scores during the annual merit review in spring semester.

A Sample Rubric for assigning point values to activities summarized above in this policy document, and a Scoring sheet used to translate the rubric scores into a weighted score for this year. See rubric appended at the end of this document.

**Eligibility:** In early May of each year, after EARTH Annual Reports have been submitted by faculty, the Head determines which, if any, faculty members are eligible for merit consideration. To qualify, the faculty member must have performed satisfactorily in research, teaching, and service. More specifically: Is there evidence of publications, presentations, or grant submissions averaged over the preceding several years? Did they attend to assigned teaching responsibilities in a professional and responsible manner? Did they participate in faculty meetings and meet assigned service responsibilities in a professional and responsible manner? If the answer is no to any, then they are not considered eligible, and the head should inform them as soon as possible.

**Merit Advisory Committee (MAC):** The Merit Advisory Committee consists of four members, three of whom are elected by the faculty with the provision that the committee not contain spouses. Each elected member serves for three years, with one member rotating off each year. The committee member who is in the final year of their three-year term will serve as the Chair. The fourth member is appointed for a single-year term by the Head to help balance representation.

Spouses or others with similar conflicts of interest cannot serve at the same time to ensure that every faculty member is anonymously evaluated by at least three committee members who do not know of each other's scorings.

**Submission:** Eligible faculty submit their requests for merit to the Staff (copied to head) by the deadline to be announced at least one week in advance in late spring. Submissions will consist of (1) the EARTH Annual Report Form and (2) The Provost's Annual Report (Detailed) under the tab 'Rapid Reports' from HuskyDM.

**Files Posted:** The staff and head ensure that every submitted file is available to all faculty to ensure transparency. Members of the MAC make an initial review of the files to get a sense of the range and scope.

**First Merit Meeting:** The Head calls a meeting to discuss the common rubric to be used to score all submissions uniformly by four different evaluators. Details will vary year by year.

**Individual Scoring:** The members of the MAC work independently, developing their own exact technique for translating the merit documents into numerical scores for all nominated faculty based on the common rubric agreed to by the MAC, based on the descriptions approved by the whole faculty. Numerical values will be assigned for the subtotals of Research, Teaching, and Service for each submission by summing whatever numerical entries were made and by applying the weights. During this process, the individuals of the MAC may contact individual faculty about listings, and each other for clarifications of methodologies, but not about individual cases. These results of each committee member will be kept strictly anonymous, along with comments (if any), prior to submission to the Head for compilation.

**Compilation by Head:** The Head, compiles the scores and comments of three or four MAC members (anonymous to each other but not to the head) into a summary table with summary scores (see example) and returns the results back to individual members of the MAC with the nominee's names removed. Should the spouse of the Head be among the faculty, his/her scores will not be reported to the Head. Instead, they shall be sent to that person's supervisor, as identified in the relevant COI agreement. The results for different MAC members will be normalized to account for individual variation between reviews. Scores will be reported in such a way that members of the MAC will not be able to see how other members of the MAC rated them. Though most faculty will have 4 independent reviews, members of the committee will have only 3 because they cannot review themselves. This requires using an average compiled score, rather than a total. Committee members will ensure that the difference in number of scorings ( $n=3$  vs.  $n=4$ ) will have minimal impact on the results, perhaps by using an additional numerical technique as needed. To prevent errors, and in confidence, a second pair of eyes other than the faculty being evaluated will be asked to check for data entry and computational errors. When finalized, the Head's compilation is reported back to the committee.

**Second Merit Meeting:** The Head calls a second meeting of the MAC with three objectives. First is to discuss the anonymous compilation, inspect the record for errors, and identify and discuss outliers. Members will recuse themselves from discussing their own files. Comments and concerns about the methodology, and qualitative reports will be discussed. Before this part of the meeting is over, the committee will agree to a final set of subtotal and total scores to be converted to a ratio

score (individual scores/sum of scores) ranging from 0.0 to 1.0. At this point, the work shifts to the qualitative input to the Head regarding the In-Residence Faculty and Joint Faculty. The third objective is to discuss qualitative merit recommendations for the Head to be forwarded to the Dean. The Head is recused for this discussion.

**Discretion of the Head:** An agreed-upon percentage of the total score for Tenure System Faculty will be used by the head to raise one or more scores awarded by the committee using the rubric. Note that 90% of the merit scoring is done by an anonymous committee. One reason for reserving some discretion for the head is that only the Head can see all of the scorings, and thus account for anomalies or variation introduced by uneven averaging (n=4 vs. n=3). This discretion will be reported back to the committee only if necessary.

**Reporting Back to Individual Faculty:** Scores will be reported back to individual faculty by the Head in such a way that their total merit score and their three subtotal scores of Research, Teaching, and Service are seen relative to the means for other faculty. All scores are reported anonymously except for the individual being written to. Only raw scores are reported at this time because percentage scores and dollar amounts may change if other faculty successfully appeal.

**Appeal:** Faculty wishing to appeal should do so ASAP to the Head, who may convene a third meeting to discuss it.

**Committee Reports to Dean (if required):** By this stage, the MAC has already met to discuss merit for the Head as a faculty member and as an administrator. They will report to the Dean, using qualitative comments and/or the semi-quantitative metrics applied to Tenure System faculty. The MAC chair (with seniority) sends a letter to the Dean after a draft has been approved by all four members.

**Dismissal of Committee:** With appeals of faculty completed, the Committee is dissolved for the year.

**Report to Dean:** After all appeals have been heard, and some scores possibly adjusted, the Head will: (1) allocate a dollar portion of the merit pool for In-Residence faculty deemed meritorious; (2) allocate the remaining dollar value of the merit pool to Tenure System faculty using the ratios compiled anonymously by the committee and adjusted by the head's discretion; (3) recommend to the Dean the dollar amounts for the In-Residence and Tenure System faculty; and (4) recommend to the Dean and(or) Provost any additional awards for special merit, should that be warranted.

# Sample Rubric for assigning point values to individual faculty contributions

*Note: These are all based on a 10 point scale. Enter these numbers into the next sheet for each individual faculty. These scores will be weighted based on the yearly decision, in this case 45% Research, 30% Teaching, and 25% Service.*

## **Research Rubric**

*Note: The research scores occur within groupings from low to high and do not sum.*

A maximum of 10 merit points can be awarded across all of the following categories of research activity.

### **Generally 1 to 3 Points. Strong research productivity as reflected in as reflected in activities such as:**

- Takes a leadership role in a least one high quality publication published in a major, highly-ranked journal in Geosciences or a related field;
- Several research presentations, including perhaps an invited or keynote address;
- Takes a leadership role in grant submissions (including internal grants);
- Awarded small research award from internal or external source.

### **Generally 4 to 6 Points. Excellent research productivity as reflected in as reflected in activities such as:**

- Takes a leadership role in several quality publications published in major journals or leading academic publishers;
- Publication of an edited or co-authored book with a major academic publisher;
- Award of substantial research grant from major external source;
- Submission of numerous research proposals (funded or declined);
- Many national and international research presentations, some of which may be invited;
- May have earned a research-based award (CLAS or UConn Awards, AAUP Awards, etc.);

### **Generally 7 to 10 Points. Exceptional research productivity as reflected as reflected in activities such as:**

- First-authored publications in more than one top journal (or equivalent);
- Sole or lead author on a peer-reviewed or equivalent book or research monograph;
- A major grant as a PI from major funding agency (e.g., NSF, NASA, NOAA, DOE, etc.);
- A major research fellowship (e.g., Fulbright, Guggenheim, etc.) ;
- A major research award (e.g., Member National Academy of Sciences, or Fellow of a major Society).

*Enter Single Research Score here (n/10)*

## **Teaching Rubric**

*Note: These are not groupings, but activities. They sum to a total.*

A maximum of 10 merit points can be awarded across all of the following categories of teaching activity.

**Generally 1-6 Points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10. Commitment to updating and improving the quality of one's own instruction as reflected in activities such as:**

- Shows significant improvement in teaching evaluations that respond to changes in subfield; pedagogical developments; and institutional needs;
- Substantial updates to existing courses;
- Develops or teaches new course or courses;
- Takes advantage of opportunities to improve teaching;
- Development of course materials such as a textbook or laboratory manual primarily for use at UConn.

**Generally 1-2 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10. Significant contribution beyond own contracted or compensated (summer and intersession) courses as reflected as reflected in activities such as:**

- Teaching additional courses and laboratory sections in a given year to help meet department needs;
- Teaching a greater than average proportion of large enrollment courses that serve the department's GenEd courses or other program needs.

**Generally 1-2 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10. Significant individualized instruction as reflected in activities such as:**

- Publishes with undergraduate and graduate students, recognizing that research publications with students will also be credited under "Research" (above);
- Strongly involved in education beyond normal teaching and advising responsibilities, such as advising honors students; internships; and independent study credits;
- Primary advisor for substantial numbers of graduating master's and PhD students.

**Generally about 1-2 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10: Exceptional contributions to teaching and learning as reflected as reflected in activities such as:**

- Major curriculum development effort—new certificate, degree plan, major curriculum revision;
- Major university or professional teaching award (e.g., AAUP, NCGE, AAG, etc.);
- Funding or grants acquired to improve courses or curricula and also to develop new facilities and programs.

*Enter Sum of Teaching Scores here (n/10)*

## **Service Rubric**

*Note: These are not groupings, but activities. They sum to a total.*

A maximum of 10 merit points can be awarded across all of the following categories of service activity.

**Generally about 1-3 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10: Significant service to the Department, CLAS or UConn as reflected as reflected in activities such as:**

- Chair of major departmental committee (PTR, Undergraduate Coordinator, Merit, Search, etc.)
- Chair or active member of major college or university committee (Senate, C&C, College PTR, etc.)
- Leadership role in interdisciplinary major program or research center/institute

**Generally about 1-3 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10: Significant service or outreach to the general public or non-academic communities at the local, state, national or international levels as reflected as reflected in activities such as:**

- Significant public outreach through presentations and testimony
- Work or research that result in presentations, reports, exhibitions, and other products not covered under research
- Significant public outreach through online resources and public correspondence
- Work or research that result in presentations, reports, exhibitions, and other products not covered under research

**Generally about 1-3 points, but more can be awarded up to the maximum of 10: Significant service to the discipline as reflected in activities such as:**

- Elected or appointed member of a significant professional committee
- Serving as external reviewer for a Geosciences program reviews
- Serving as a referee for one or more promotion reviews
- Chair of professional committee such in a national organization
- Member of granting agency panel (e.g., NSF, NASA, etc.)
- Involvement in ad hoc peer review process
- Membership in editorial boards of journals
- Guest editor of a major journal
- Significant number of book reviews and similar publications
- Organizer of a significant conference, workshop or meeting
- Editor of a journal or book series
- Officer or leader of professional organization
- Leader or active member of a major national or international committee (e.g., ICDP, NRC, IPCC, etc.)

*Enter Sum of Service Scores here (n/10)*

# PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT IN EARTH SCIENCES

---

This information is intended to complement other applicable UConn guidelines and regulations. Candidates and committees at all stages of the PTR process, including faculty in both tenure-system and in-residence positions, should consult the [Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment](#) website at the Office of the Provost and relevant information in the [Guidelines and Procedures](#) of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

If any policies outlined herein conflict with those established by the Provost, College, and/or AAUP, then the latter policies will take precedence. The following PTR guidelines of the Department of Earth Sciences (ERTH) are guided by the principles prescribed in the University By-Laws:

“The value of a faculty member to the University results from the possession of a number of different qualities. In enumerating certain of these, it is not intended to formulate a rigid set of standards, nor to require that all faculty attain a stated minimum in each of the items. The value of each person is rather to be judged by both strengths and weaknesses so as to arrive at an estimate of his/her total contribution. No fixed numerical weighting can be prescribed, though greater emphasis should be placed on scholarship, teaching ability, and activity in research than on other characteristics” (Article XIV D, By-Laws of the University of Connecticut).

## Expectations and Evaluation Criteria

PTR is awarded in recognition of faculty contributions to the mission of the University in the areas of: a) scholarship and research; b) teaching and advising of undergraduate students, graduate students, and post-docs; and c) service to the department, university, and discipline as well as to the many audiences outside of the UConn community. While a successful candidate need not excel in every category, a candidate’s application must reflect significant and sustained scholarly productivity, a record of successful teaching, and a pattern of effective service. The University of Connecticut is a leading research university, so a candidate’s record of sustained scholarly productivity is the most important factor in earning promotion, tenure, and reappointment. The Department of Earth Sciences expects its faculty to achieve national or international prominence in their chosen field of research.

### **A. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

#### **1. Research**

The typical candidate’s record of excellence in research will include the following:



- a. Publication of original scholarship and research that forms a coherent and significant body of work. Success will be primarily indicated by multiple articles in prestigious, peer-reviewed journals, and may also include sole-or co-authored books and edited volumes, invited papers in edited volumes, and monographs. In some subfields, scholarship may be published in other forms, such as software packages, models, and datasets. There is no set number of publications required to meet these standards because establishing a reputation in a given field may involve different criteria. In general, it is expected that faculty will on average take a leadership role (e.g., lead author) in at least one high-quality publication or research product each year in a major journal in Geosciences or a related field. All else being equal, more is better than less, but this is not simply a question of quantity because it also involves issues of publication quality, placement, and leadership among other factors. Achievements completed before beginning employment at UConn may be considered. Note concerning co-authorship: Geoscience research is increasingly collaborative. In compiling their tenure portfolio, the definitions of publication status listed below must be followed. Candidates are encouraged to describe their individual contributions to collaborative studies, and to identify authors or co-authors who completed their contributions under the candidate's mentorship (e.g., major advisees, or other advisees who received similarly significant levels of mentorship).
- b. Research that has grown well beyond work undertaken for the dissertation and for postdoctoral positions, and evidence of continuing productivity (e.g., manuscripts that are submitted or in preparation).
- c. Funding and applications for funding sufficient to support the candidate's research program. The contributions of the individual candidate to collaborative projects, both proposed and funded, both as PI and co-PI, should be described briefly. External peer reviews of unfunded proposals can be provided to aid in evaluation. Note concerning funding: Research approaches in the geosciences vary in their funding requirements, and the Department recognizes that external funding is not always a prerequisite for excellence in research and scholarship. In cases where research caliber and productivity have been demonstrated and can be maintained in the absence of external funding, the lack of funding will not count against the applicant. However, candidates *are* expected to seek adequate funding for their research program.
- d. Stature or distinction in the field, e.g., evidence of national recognition, and a trajectory auguring sustained research excellence. Evidence may include but is not limited to the following: invitations to present in national or international symposia, national or international awards or honors, keynote addresses, visiting professorships, service on peer review committees, journal editorships, professional society service, etc. The external evaluators should highlight and explain the significance of these achievements.

## **2. Course-Based Teaching**

Candidates are expected to teach, develop and maintain strong, effective courses that are current, accessible, based in scholarship, and consistent with departmental goals. Student evaluations will be treated as one component of teaching effectiveness, and will be considered in conjunction with additional evidence of classroom effectiveness via the SET+ program (see description in section on Assessing Teaching Effectiveness in Earth Sciences). The candidate's teaching record will be described in a teaching portfolio.

### **3. Mentoring**

Indicators of such mentoring include, but are not limited to, serving as the major or associate advisor for M.S. and Ph.D. students, involving undergraduate students in research that may lead to presentations, publications, data sets, software products, etc., offering individual research and field experience courses, garnering of awards for students (e.g., research, travel, or honorary awards), and helping students advance to the next stage of their education or careers.

### **3. Service and Scholarly Engagement**

GSCI recognizes that the Department, College, and University depend on the myriad contributions of individuals, and that service to the profession is an essential component of academic professionalism. Scholarly engagement (outreach), meaning disseminating to the general public aspects of scholarship or professionalism in the geosciences and related fields, is a similarly fundamental activity. Service and engagement contributions count less towards promotion and tenure than either teaching or research. While all faculty are expected to participate in service to the Department, College or University and to conduct engagement, pre-tenure faculty members are excused from the most demanding assignments (e.g., chairs of major committees). They should, however, actively participate in at least one substantial Department, College, or University committee per year, or equivalent in bylaws-designated tasks, and actively participate in at least one national or international professional association.

## **B. Promotion to Professor**

### **1. Feedback prior to applying for promotion:**

Associate professors may meet with the head or the department's PTR Committee at any time to discuss progress toward promotion. However, it is recommended that associate professors meet with the head and the PTR Committee at least every third year beyond promotion to associate rank to discuss plans for further advancement. The suggested time for these meetings is in the late spring at the close of the merit review process.

### **2. Timeline:**

Typically, promotion to full professor should be considered after at least five years of service as an associate professor, except when there is clear evidence of the candidate's superior achievement.

### **3. Criteria for Promotion:**

Promotion to full professor requires significant and sustained achievement in research, teaching, and service. A major emphasis is given to the research accomplishments, and it is imperative that the candidate has made important contributions that have had a significant impact in his/her field(s). The complete body of work (both pre-tenure and post-tenure) should be examined to determine whether the candidate is likely to continue to produce high quality research at an appropriate output. In particular, candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to demonstrate the following:

#### **a. Scholarship:**

The candidate for full professor should have achieved recognition as an expert in his or her field at the national level and recognition at the international level. This work should be comparable in

significance and impact to the work of newly promoted full professors at Earth Sciences/Geosciences departments of peer and aspirant institutions working in similar fields. In general, quality is more important than quantity, although the quantity and continuity must be sufficient to show a significant, sustained level of quality scholarly productivity and impact. This assessment is done by examining the impact of the candidate's peer-reviewed publications, as well as non-peer-reviewed book chapters, books, invited published commentaries, or perspectives. This assessment may be based in part on metrics (keeping in mind that subdisciplines can have different citation rates), but also on less quantifiable factors such as the evaluation of external reviewers and having work included in reviews and textbooks. Additional factors may include invited conference presentations (e.g., plenary lectures), invitations to departmental seminars, receipt of research-related awards, patents, etc. Major services on review panels (e.g., NSF, NASA, DOE, USGS, EPA, USDA, etc.), to learned societies, or journal editorships etc. may also be considered as evidence of scholarship. The external evaluators should highlight and explain the significance of these achievements. The level of research funding should be commensurate with the area(s) of the candidate's research. The Department of Earth Sciences supports interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship. For candidates who collaborate extensively, it is expected that the candidate's contributions are original and significant.

**b. Teaching and mentoring:**

Evidence of excellence in teaching and mentoring of undergraduates, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral fellows, and/or junior faculty is expected. Assessment of teaching excellence involves multiple factors that will include SET+ and a teaching portfolio. Assessment of mentoring success may be demonstrated by factors like M.S. and Ph.D. advisees completing their degrees, winning awards, and obtaining desired professional outcomes.

**c. Service:** Outstanding service contributions to the Department, College, University, or profession, and to public outreach is expected. Examples include chairing major departmental committees (PTR, Undergraduate, Graduate, Merit, Search, etc.), being an active member of major college or university committees (Senate, C&C, College PTR, etc.), and/or having a leadership role in one or more professional organizations. Reviewing activities for journals and grant agencies, service on review panels, service to learned societies (e.g., officers of professional societies, organizers of meetings, journal editorships), or consulting activities to private or public entities on a regular basis are also expected.

## **C. Promotion of In Residence Faculty**

The work of in-residence and clinical faculty is essential to the academic mission of EARTH and to the lives of our students. As indicated in the CLAS Guidelines and Procedures, in-residence faculty should be evaluated in accordance with the terms of their appointment, encompassing any changes to their appointments.

**1. Feedback prior to applying for promotion:**

Assistant or Associate Professors in Residence may meet with the head or the department's PTR Committee at any time to discuss progress toward promotion. However, it is recommended that Assistant Professors in Residence meet with the head and the PTR Committee for a Midpoint

Review it is recommended that associate professors meet with the head and the PTR Committee at least every third year beyond promotion to associate rank to discuss plans for further advancement. The suggested time for these meetings is in the fall to coincide with the normal work of the PTR committee.

## **2. Timeline**

According to university and CLAS policies, in-residence and clinical faculty may be offered a multi-year contract after completing one year of employment and *must* be offered multi-year contracts if reappointed after completing six consecutive years in title. After a multi-year contract is awarded, subsequent reappointments must also be for multiple years unless just cause is given for non-reappointment.

Review of faculty for reappointment to a second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth year, and for the renewal of a multi-year contract, shall be carried out by the head of the department. Only promotion cases will be advanced to the provost's office for review and approval. Faculty seeking promotion to associate professor in residence or professor in residence should follow the provost's P&R procedure with the same deadlines and committees as the tenure-track process.

## **3. Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor In Residence**

Candidates are expected to meet or exceed criteria associated with the duties outlined in their appointment documents. In EARTH, required duties focus on teaching, and do not include requirements for research or service. In this regard, promotion requires evidence of sustained high-quality teaching at the undergraduate and(or) graduate level. Such evidence may consist of honors and awards, a list of courses taught, evaluations of teaching (SET, SET+, other), and a teaching portfolio. CLAS Guidelines and Procedures also require evidence that 1. achievements and levels of performance are competitive with those of faculty members in parallel appointments at comparable institutions, and 2. candidates have a clear record of sustained excellence in the areas specified in their appointment document.

## **4. Expectations for Promotion to Professor In Residence**

Candidates are expected to meet or exceed criteria associated with the duties outlined in their appointment documents. In EARTH, required duties focus on teaching, and do not include requirements for research or service. In this regard, promotion requires evidence of sustained high-quality teaching at the undergraduate and(or) graduate level. Such evidence may consist of honors and awards, a list of courses taught, evaluations of teaching (SET, SET+, other), and a teaching portfolio. CLAS Guidelines and Procedures also require candidates have experienced an appropriate period in rank as an associate professor. It is also expected that 1. achievements and levels of performance are competitive with those of faculty members in parallel appointments at comparable institutions, 2. candidates offer evidence of growth in the profession consistent with their letter of appointment, which might include scholarship on teaching and learning, and 3. candidates have a clear record of sustained excellence in the areas specified in their appointment document.

PTR Committee

The PTR Committee is charged with evaluating the dossiers of candidates for promotion, reappointment, and/or tenure and advising the Head on each candidate's qualifications. This includes both tenure track and CIRE candidates. The committee makes a formal recommendation by vote and summarizes its evaluation and vote in a written report.

Selection procedures for the PTR Committee are described in the EARTH bylaws.

The candidate may address the committee at any meeting.

The PTR report for any candidate should state whether members of the committee have possible conflicts of interest with the candidates being considered. Members of the PTR committee with a clear conflict of interest in a given case (according to relevant State of Connecticut or University of Connecticut rules) must recuse themselves from all discussion and voting on that candidate. If the Department Head has a conflict of interest with the candidate, they must notify the Dean's Office accordingly, and a senior member of the faculty will be appointed by the Dean's Office to assume the Head's duties.

## PTR Policies for Tenure-Track Faculty

### **Reappointment procedures**

Tenure-track faculty are reviewed each year during the period leading to the promotion/tenure year. All tenure-track candidates must annually update and submit dossiers guided by the appropriate PTR form from the Provost's office. The dossier will be reviewed by the EARTH PTR committee, the Head, the CLAS PTR committee, and the Dean.

The AAUP requires that SET evaluations be augmented by additional forms of teaching evaluation, including SET+. The approved department's policy for SET+, provided in another section of this handbook, must be followed.

The Department Head will meet annually with all tenure track candidates to discuss performance, goals, responsibilities, and expectations.

The Provost conducts a Midpoint review of all tenure-track faculty at the beginning (in the fall) of their third year. It will provide concrete and specific feedback that can be used both to assess whether a contract should be renewed and whether progress is being made toward achieving standards for promotion and tenure.

This Midpoint Review will be managed by the department's PTR Committee and Head, according to university and college policies and procedures. The PTR committee may ask the faculty member to provide other pertinent information to help them conduct the extended third year review.

### **Tenure and Promotion Procedures**

Review of tenure track faculty for promotion and/or tenure follows procedures established by the Provost's office and provided on the [Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment](#) website maintained by the Office of the Provost. Additional guidelines are provided in the [CLAS Guidelines and Procedures](#).

Faculty who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion the following year should indicate their desire to be promoted (or not be considered) by March (see timeline below).

Each candidate for Promotion or Tenure will submit a list of 5 or more external reviewers to the Department Head. Reviewers will be individuals with an outstanding national or international reputation in the applicant's field of study and who hold a tenured position or equivalent. Reviewers will typically hold positions at or above the level of promotion being sought. These external letters should not be from close acquaintances, former mentors, or frequent collaborators. Candidates have the option of listing other potential reviewers with whom they have potential conflicts of interest, to prevent them from being chosen by the committee.

The PTR Committee, in consultation with appropriate faculty, will prepare a list of 5 or more additional external reviewers. From the separate lists provided by the candidate and the PTR committee, the Head will select 6-12 outside reviewers who will be contacted for reviews. At least half of these will come from the candidate's list.

The PTR Committee and Head may also collect pertinent information from inside or outside the University as stipulated by the University Procedures regarding Promotion and Tenure. The PTR Committee will review all pertinent data and appraise the performance and potential in *Research*, *Teaching* (including evaluations), and *Service* performances and potential of each faculty member under consideration, basing its appraisal on the criteria listed in Article XIV, Section D of the University of Connecticut's Bylaws (2013 ed.) and the criteria outlined in the EARTH PTR policies.

Candidates can reference to quantitative measures designed to assess scholarly productivity and impact: (e.g., impact factors, h-index) in the documents they submit to the PTR committee. The PTR committee, on their own, can also use these measures in their evaluation of a candidate's scholarly achievement. The committee is also free to consider the related issues of who cites a candidate's work, how often it is cited, and the ratings of journals where candidates publish their work, bearing in mind that quantitative measures vary among subdisciplines and career stages.

Assessment of scholarly productivity will consider the relative workload imposed by the candidate's teaching and service assignments.

If the candidate is a Regional Campus faculty member, input will be sought from the Campus Director.

If an EARTH faculty member has a joint appointment with another campus unit, the Director or Head of that unit shall also serve as a non-voting member of the EARTH PTR committee and will be invited to all committee meetings in which the candidate's dossier is discussed. If the director or head is unable to serve, they will be asked to nominate a colleague to serve as a non-voting member, subject to approval by the PTR committee. The non-voting member should provide input to the PTR committee on the candidate's contributions to their unit, including guidance on specialized

journals in the joint field of study. The terms of memos of understanding (MOUs) and any amendments will be taken into account by the PTR committee.

The PTR Committee will summarize all materials, then advise the Department Head of their decision by making a formal recommendation by vote and submission of its views in a written report. Any dissenting opinions shall be recorded with supporting data in this report. Substantive negative findings by the PTR Committee are those that would prevent one or more members from voting in favor of a candidate's promotion. Provost's Guidelines (Section II, points 5 and 6) require that, in response to negative findings, candidates may appear before the committee and(or) submit written statements before the committee votes. After such hearings, committee members opposing promotion must record their dissenting votes in the Committee's letter to the Department Head with supporting evidence.

If the Head is unable to support a candidate's promotion, this also qualifies as substantial negative findings. The reasons for the findings must be provided to the candidate before the Head's report is submitted. The candidate must have a chance to respond to the Head regarding negative findings in person, in writing, or both before the Head completes the PTR evaluation.

Candidates will be informed of the final recommendations of the PTR Committee and Head. These recommendations, along with all supporting data and any dissenting opinions, will be submitted by the Head to the Dean of CLAS. Each candidate will receive a copy of the PTR recommendation page.

If either the Department Head or the PTR committee makes a negative recommendation to the Dean, the faculty member may submit to the Dean a written statement presenting a case for consideration by the Dean and the Dean's Advisory Council. The faculty member must submit this statement to the Dean within one week after being informed in writing of the recommendation by the Department Head.

## **Suggested Timeline**

*March:* Faculty should inform the Head if they wish to be considered for promotion or tenure in the following year. Withdrawal from consideration may be requested at any time.

*May-June:* All faculty being considered for promotion or tenure should submit to a full CV to the Head. The PTR Committee (all faculty at or above rank, with the head appointing the chair) begins working with candidates to prepare materials for transmission to outside reviewers, suggesting improvements to CV and teaching, research, and service statements. These statements may be similar to the responses included in UConn's internal PTR form, but candidates may wish to tailor them to reflect the different audience. The PTR Committee and candidates submit their list of outside reviewers (with email addresses) to the Head. The Head contacts potential outside reviewers to confirm their willingness to participate, providing deadlines for letters.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure provide CV, teaching and research statements, and reprints of publications for transmission by the Department to the outside reviewers.

*Summer:* Head transmits all materials to outside reviewers.

*Third Friday in August:* All candidates for promotion or reappointment submit the factual PTR form (available from the Provost's website to the PTR Committee. The PTR Committee will evaluate the PTR form to determine if it is complete; if not, they will request additional information from the candidates or Head.

*First Friday in September:* All revised individual completed PTR files are due in the Department office to be made available to the PTR Committee. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the file.

*Third Friday in September:* Following one or more meetings, the Chair of the PTR Committee submits the committee's promotion, tenure and reappointment recommendations to the Head, and informs each candidate of the PTR Committee committee's recommendation. Candidates are permitted to appear before the PTR Committee before a final recommendation is made to the Head.

*First Friday in October:* Final recommendations of the PTR Committee and Head, along with all supporting data and any dissenting opinions, are submitted by the Head to the Dean of CLAS. The Department Head informs each candidate of the Head's recommendation and provides a copy of the PTR recommendation page.

## PR Policies for In Residence Faculty

- A. For annual reappointments of in-residence faculty, the Head provides input to CLAS, with reappointment determined by satisfactory performance and the availability of funding.
- B. After the sixth year of service, reappointments will be reviewed every three years according to the AAUP contract.

The promotion of In-Residence faculty (or promotion to the first multi-year contract) requires a review and recommendation at all levels including the Provost. The *Non-Tenure Track PR Form* (P&R Form) must be used.

1. The candidate's dossier is evaluated by the Departmental PTR committee, which makes a recommendation to the Head.
2. Review of the dossier will follow the same schedule and general policies outlined for tenure-track candidates. However, some specific policies may differ (e.g., number and sources of letters of recommendation). Details can be found on the Provost's website.

## Additional Information

Definitions for listing publications:

*Published* – Any manuscript for which a complete citation or DOI (digital object identifier) can be supplied.



*In press or Accepted* – Any manuscript that has been officially accepted by an editor (acceptance documentation required).

*Submitted* – Any manuscript submitted for publication (submission documentation required).

*In Review* - Any manuscript that is in review.

*Revise and resubmit* - Any manuscript that has been reviewed and invited for resubmission following revision.

*In preparation* – Any manuscript in draft form, not yet submitted. If listed, these should be made available upon request by the Committee.

## FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICIES IN EARTH

---

This policy outlines guiding principles and procedures to ensure that faculty workload is handled consistently and equitably in the Department of Earth Sciences in a way that is also consistent with Professional Responsibilities expectations defined by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS).

### 1. Research and Scholarly Activity in EARTH

Tenure-system faculty members are expected to produce specific evidence of strong performance in scholarship (in the form of research, other intellectual contributions, and artistic activities). The *minimum* expectation is for tenure-line faculty to be “research-active,” as defined below. Those who do not meet this expectation are subject to increases in teaching and/or service loads, as outlined in Sections 2 and 3.

#### Definition of Research Active in EARTH

A research active faculty member creates and disseminates new knowledge as demonstrated by substantial productivity via: (1) actively publishing or disseminating original scholarly work in highly regarded, peer-reviewed journals and scholarly books, and(or) widely used publications such as such as field trip guides and short course texts dependent on original research; (2) maintaining an appropriately funded laboratory and/or field research program with engaged graduate and(or) undergraduate students, and (3) serving as an editor or on editorial boards for journals and books, contributing individually by reviewing manuscripts & proposals, serving on research funding panels and research policy boards, and communicating results via professional meetings. Meeting two of the three criteria is sufficient.

Research activity is not synonymous with research success. Rejections and failures are part of the process, and they are inherently unpredictable. For the purpose of making this designation, the effort spent toward publishing and obtaining funding are important.

The decision of whether a faculty member meets this definition will be made anonymously by a majority vote of the Merit Advisory Committee (MAC) at the conclusion of the annual merit process, subject to oversight by the Head. To avoid a conflict of interest, the Head is exempt from the designation of research active. The designation of whether a faculty member is research active will be initially made by the Merit Advisory Committee, based on the current merit year. This designation will incorporate the research results of the two preceding merit years on a case-by-case basis. The goal is to integrate judgment over several years to avoid the year-to-year fluctuations in output inherent in our discipline.

The designation will be made at three levels:

- Fully research active, unambiguously meeting the definition above based on performance in two or more criteria, often three.
- Partially research active, meeting the definition of research active, but with strong performance in only one category.

- Not research active, not meeting the definition owing to limited performance in all three categories.

The MAC will inform the Head of the designations. The Head will inform each faculty member of their designation and meet individually with each faculty member whose is identified as “partially research active” or “not research active” for consultation about the decision and discussion about how to proceed. The purpose is for the Head to give guidance to faculty on steps that can be taken before and when a designation changes. The Head will then make the final decision about the designation that will incorporate case-by-case circumstances. Faculty who are deemed to be “not research active” or “partially research active” may be subject increases in teaching load, as discussed in Section 2 of this document. Faculty wishing to appeal designations of their level of research activity may do so in writing to the Head, who will adjudicate appeals on a case-by-case basis.

## 2. Teaching in ERTH

Above all, UConn is an educational institution, having been founded as a school before growing into a college and then a university. Teaching has always been essential and must be coordinated at the levels of the department, college, and university. This document lays out clear guidelines for the administration of assigned teaching within ERTH for undergraduate, graduate, and cross-listed courses with undergraduate and graduate enrollments. This document excludes one-on-one teaching/supervision/advising/mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students and small seminar courses.

### Teaching Assignment Procedures

ERTH has four categories of faculty relevant here. The procedures for assigning teaching are different for each.

### Non-Tenure System Faculty

#### Research Faculty

Because this category of faculty is fully funded by grants, ERTH does not assign teaching to research faculty. If they volunteer to teach an official UConn course, they may do so, subject to approval by the Head, the ERTH C&C Committee, and a research supervisor, if applicable.

#### In-Residence Faculty

These are full-time unionized AAUP professors and full voting members of the faculty who are specifically employed to meet the teaching needs of the department.

CLAS policy reads: *"The standard teaching load for in-residence faculty members is seven courses per academic year. With permission of the College, research, service, outreach, advising, or administrative duties may be substituted for a portion of the teaching obligation."* Within this constraint, ERTH policy is as follows:

- Reappointments will be made in late Spring Semester with the seven-course load (or equivalent duties) specified for the following academic year.
- Teaching duties are primarily committed to cover regularly offered introductory (1000-level) and 2000-level courses.

- Will rotate responsibility for our introductory geoscience courses (1050/1051/1052 lab supervision) on alternate semesters.
- In-residence faculty will teach one course (explicitly defined or special topics) in their research specialty at least once every other year. This may be a named course (i.e., 3040 Earth Materials or 3230 Beaches & Coasts) or a special topics course (i.e., 4995 Special Topics, or 4998 Variable Topics).
- Subject to the Head's approval, in-residence faculty are encouraged to negotiate among themselves to cover the courses scheduled by the C&C committee.
- At the discretion of the Head, specific administrative tasks requiring substantial time may take the place of up to 1 course per year for each APiR (i.e., supervision and coordination of TAs in teaching labs).

## **Tenure-System Faculty:**

### **Joint Faculty with Primary Appointment Elsewhere**

Teaching assignments are made by in accordance with the MOUs of Joint Appointees. EARTH will monitor and recommend to the home departments courses to be taught with special focus on cross-listed courses and those needed by our students.

### **Faculty with tenure homes in EARTH**

As the tenure home department, EARTH has full responsibility over teaching assignments, except for those specified by MOUs.

According to CLAS policy, the standard teaching load for tenure-system faculty members who are research-active and participate in the typical amount of department and College service is set by the department, with the approval of the dean, based on documented disciplinary standards. In EARTH, this equates to a "one-one" teaching load. CLAS dictates that a faculty members' teaching be distributed across both semesters of the academic year, with exceptions only for special circumstances. Reductions may be made in instances of formal leave, temporary reductions given to new hires and tenure-track faculty, significant administrative responsibilities, or research buyouts. In general, any reductions in teaching load shall result from consultation between the Head and the faculty member.

The basic unit of measure, according to CLAS, is a traditional 3- or 4-credit, regularly scheduled undergraduate or graduate course that meets enrollment targets and in which the faculty member is the sole instructor. This policy also states that team-taught courses count as 1/n courses, where n is the number of participating faculty. Where courses do not meet enrollment targets, exceptions may be made in cases where enrolled students require courses to in order to graduate or when a course is offered for the first time. Such situations will be resolved on a case-by-case basis by the Head through discussion with the faculty member.

#### *1. Assignment of Load*

According to departmental policy discussed above, the default load for EARTH faculty who are research-active is 1:1. This is particularly important for pre-tenure faculty because reappointment and Tenure in a Carnegie R1 institution requires documentation of research performance on par with that required by our definition of fully "research active." Pre-tenure research-active faculty may

have a, one-time, 1-course (no-teaching) reduction during a semester agreeable to the Head and the faculty member. This agreement assumes one year's notice.

Following CLAS policy, any faculty member deemed “partially research active” or “research inactive” will be assigned up to a 2:2 load, pending extenuating circumstances. With the Head's approval, one or more of these courses may be a graduate seminar or special topics course.

Department policy is to fully support family leaves subject to CLAS, university, and AAUP regulations. We will be especially flexible with respect to reduction in teaching (and/or service) loads for reasons of maternity/paternity and family illness.

## *2. Teaching Capacity and Course Assignment*

Toward the end of each calendar year, the Head should know the teaching capacity for the coming academic year. Capacity is currently the sum of course loads for in-residence and tenure-line faculty discounted for joint faculty teaching, sabbaticals, buyouts, and other releases. After the capacity is known, the Head will initially assign courses according to the current default 2-year rotating schedule of courses for the upcoming Fall-Spring semesters. As much as possible, teaching assignments will consider faculty teaching strengths and preferences. Assignments will also consider factors that affect workload, such as class size, whether a course includes a lab, is grading intensive (i.e., for “W” courses), or a new prep, as well as whether or not a GA is assigned. The overall goal is to achieve an equitable workload, insofar as possible, over the two-year rotation. It is assumed that any unevenness in workload will be considered in merit decisions.

Any faculty member who at this point is not assigned a full load according to the default schedule has a responsibility to teach more. At this stage, these faculty members may request to the Head certain courses. Taking the sum total of requests into account, the Head will provisionally assign one or more course sections to faculty, based on departmental priorities, and taking individual teaching strengths and interests into account. At this stage, the faculty members and the Head will negotiate in good faith to reach an agreement. In rare circumstances (e.g., a canceled course), combinations of 2-credit and 1-credit courses can be used at the discretion of the head to satisfy a standard course in the faculty member's load.

## *3. Voluntary Courses*

Faculty may volunteer to teach above and beyond the assigned load, provided it does not impinge on their research and service productivity, as determined by the Head. Such volunteering is encouraged as a service to our department, the college, and the university. For example, faculty may want to teach specific 1-credit courses such Honors Seminars (UNIV 1784) and First Year Experience, or 1-2 credit trainings and field trips using variable credit, special topics courses (4995), or help guest lecture for another program in exchange for the visibility. Alternatively, a faculty member may want to cover courses for someone else on a temporary basis, for whatever reason. Volunteering in this way will be considered just cause for merit.

## *4. Schedule of Teaching Capacity*

The Merit Committee will designate which faculty are “research active” in May of each year. Because the fall semester teaching schedule is already set late in the fall semester, meeting the required teaching loads for the coming academic year may be difficult. Though every attempt will be made to finish the load requirement either by adding a course in the fall or teaching another in the spring,

this may not be feasible. If so, the load requirement can be met by teaching in some future semester or by a service duty negotiated by the Head.

### *Accounting*

Long-term accounting for teaching load assigned and courses taught will be done by comparing the annual records of "Research Active" and "Service Active" with the HuskyDM reporting.

## **3. Service in EARTH**

All tenure-system faculty are expected to engage in service. Service at UConn is of two kinds, internal and external. Quoting the Provost, internal service "may include: chairing or serving on standing departmental, college/school, or University committees; advising students or serving as a faculty advisor to student organizations; writing letters of recommendation for undergraduate and graduate students; and supervising various department activities." External service is given "to both the profession and to the local, state, and national communities."

### **Procedures**

The internal service for the Department of Earth Sciences is generally described in the bylaws proper under committee work and tasks. However, that document does not offer a mechanism for accounting which essential committees and tasks are staffed, and who they were staffed by. The former is essential for departmental governance. The latter is essential for an equitable sharing of necessary workload.

For this accounting, EARTH uses spreadsheet that tracks the committee assignments and tasks performed by individual faculty on a year-to-year basis. Titled "Service Matrix," this spreadsheet is in continuous revision and available for viewing by the faculty.

#### The Service Matrix

- accounts for and clarifies ALL of the service tasks of our department for any given annual report or assessment
- creates a template that can be used to plan successive years by adding and subtracting faculty assignments; some duties continue from year to year; others rotate through terms of up to 3 years; and some are short term tasks
- offers a transparent way to monitor service activity for the sake of teamwork
- provides a quantitative method of aligning service loads towards the goal of parity

### **Determining Fair Shares**

The service matrix provides an accounting method for all service activities and the relative weights they carry, as determined by vote of the faculty. Assignments are made by the Head, in a way that considers professorial rank and ensures that loads are distributed evenly.

Faculty members who, over the period of several years, are not contributing their fair share of internal service (department, college, university) are not meeting a fundamental required professional responsibility. This designation will be made by the Department Head after consultation with the Associate Department Head.

Faculty wishing to appeal judgements of Service Active may do so in writing to the Head, who will adjudicate appeals on a case-by-case basis. Action will be initiated to rectify this issue within the rules agreed to by the AAUP and the university.

## **Assignment**

During the spring semester, the Department Head examines the Service Matrix to identify any assignments that may be added or deleted, and consult with the faculty about weightings. Starting with a new matrix for the upcoming year, the head will fill in those duties with continuing appointments because some committee memberships are for multiple years with provisions for rotating on or off. The Head will also block out sabbaticals. From this residual, the Head will determine which positions must be filled.

The Head then sends a memo to all faculty announcing open positions, and asking for volunteers to fill them. This memo will also provide an opportunity for faculty to indicate committee preferences. These will be returned ASAP to the Staff who will compile all requests in a single list. If there is no clear preference or rationale, a lottery is used to assign needed service tasks. Otherwise, the Head will assign preliminary committee memberships and tasks for the coming year.

After service assignments are made public to the faculty, faculty may request alternative assignments. These requests will be considered in light of others, and it is likely some trading will take place. By the end of the academic year on May 31, all assignments for the coming year are made.

# ASSESSING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS IN EARTH SCIENCES

*Approved by faculty consensus on November 13, 2020*

## Introduction

The Department encourages faculty to engage in professional development related to teaching and learning. This policy outlines examples and resources for faculty to use in the development and implementation of a holistic teaching assessment portfolio. Multiple methods of teaching evaluations serve a developmental purpose by providing instructors with information that (1) can be used reflectively to adjust teaching and assessment practices, (2) provide an opportunity to align programmatic goals and learning outcomes within and across units, and (3) can be used for administrative purposes towards promotion, tenure, and reappointment (PTR) evaluation. The goal of the teaching portfolio is to balance quantitative and qualitative assessment of teaching based on three components – (1) student experience, (2) peer-review, and (3) development, self-evaluation, and reflection.

Article 28 of the [AAUP collective bargaining agreement](#)<sup>1</sup> notes that: “*Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) can productively inform regarding teaching effectiveness in particular areas. In gauging teaching effectiveness, however, SETs are not to be used as the sole criterion of teaching for disciplinary measures, promotion, tenure or reappointment, or for nonreappointment with respect to full-time faculty [...]*”

The [Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Form](#) (Revised May 2018) Section 2C Evaluation of Teaching states: “*Evidence of assessment of teaching beyond the SET, such as classroom observations by peers or colleagues, mid-semester surveys, or other evidence of good teaching must also be included in Section 8-C.*”<sup>2</sup>

## Policy

ERTH faculty will have considerable flexibility in customizing how they approach and format their individualized teaching assessment portfolios. Noteworthy teaching will be based, in large part, on the faculty member’s evolving and individualized portfolios.

Implementing the new teaching assessment policy is expected to evolve over time. There is much to be learned, both for the Department (e.g., recommending peer-review best practices) and for individual faculty (e.g., fully developing a teaching portfolio).

Faculty feedback about this teaching assessment policy will be reviewed on a yearly basis, preferably yearly in the fall semester, and incorporated appropriately into policy modifications.



# Methods of Evaluation

Examples and guidelines of evaluation techniques are listed below for each pillar. Additional evaluation techniques can be found at <https://cetl.uconn.edu/set-plus/>. Faculty members may use additional evaluation techniques.

## (1) Student experience

Faculty should include multiple forms of student feedback in their teaching assessment portfolio that demonstrate effective teaching and learning from the student perspective.

Some options faculty may consider are:

- Student evaluations of teaching (SET). Note that the quantitative summary statistics are required by the university.
- **ERTH** End-semester Student Questionnaire for all courses.
- Mid-semester student surveys
  - Formative assessments collected during the semester provide ongoing feedback that may be used to improve teaching. Example mid-semester surveys are available from CETL <https://cetl.uconn.edu/mid-semester-formative-feedback/>. These questionnaires can be completed in class, through HuskyCT or online via anonymous survey tools such as Qualtrics.
  - Evidence of student learning such as before-and-after learning assessments for a given learning goal or topic.

Additional options faculty may consider to include for gauging student experience are:

- Student testimonials, such as copies of direct emails to the faculty member.
- Examples of student work (including original assignment details). Names and other student-identifying information should be removed.
- Student final reflection or personal growth essays or surveys.

## (2) Peer-review

Peer-review includes observation of the faculty member during classroom, field, or laboratory instruction. Peer-review may also include review of assignments, graded student work, or lecture material. Faculty may choose which peer to incorporate into this process and which class(es) to review. Faculty's reflection from the feedback received by the observation may be included in the PTR files (i.e. the faculty member decides on including peer evaluation).

Below are recommendations for peer-review evaluation by another faculty member (peer-reviewer):

- Faculty may request a peer-reviewer in consultation with the Department Head. The selected peer-reviewer should follow AAUP policies regarding conflict of interest, and, preferably, be someone of equal or higher faculty rank. Peer-reviewers may include ERTH faculty and faculty with primary appointments in other units as well.
- Faculty will identify a selected lecture, discussion, field and/or laboratory session to

beevaluated. Observation of entire classroom or learning period is optimal.

- Faculty will provide background material (syllabus, reading assignment) to peer-reviewer at least one week prior to the scheduled evaluation.
- Faculty is generally not evaluated by the peer-reviewer on course content unless the reviewer finds glaring issues related to content omissions or errors.
- If the faculty determines that the presence of a peer-reviewer may negatively impact the teaching and learning experience, faculty may arrange for the classroom to be video recorded and reviewed subsequently by the peer-reviewer.
- For distance learning and online modalities, faculty may arrange for teaching sessions to be recorded and reviewed subsequently by the peer-reviewer. For asynchronous courses or fully online courses, peer-review may focus on the delivery of course content and student engagement through online response.
- Peer-reviewer will provide written feedback within two weeks of the teaching observation using the standardized [ERTH Peer-Review Questionnaire](#).
- Post assessment meeting between the faculty and the peer-reviewer should ideally occur within two weeks of classroom observation.
- It is expected that faculty members contribute positively to the peer-review process. Peer-reviewers may earn credit appropriately for their department service.
- Faculty are encouraged to meet with the Department Head to discuss peer-review feedback within 4 weeks of classroom observation. If the faculty member is not in agreement with the findings after reviewing the supporting documents from the peer-reviewer, the faculty member may choose to request a subsequent evaluation, in consultation with the Department Head.

Additional options faculty may consider to include for peer-review are:

- Review of course materials and student learning assessments – particularly for new course content and substantially revised course content.
- Peer-review of student survey data and/or comments.
- CETL observation and assessment, possibly in tandem with an ERTH peer-reviewer.

### **(3) Development, self-evaluation and reflection**

Faculty should include some form of self-evaluation and written reflection of proactive steps to promote effective teaching and learning.

Some options faculty may consider are:

- Self-reflection on individual teaching modules or the course as a whole (what went well, what needs adjustments, etc.). Self-reflection may be accomplished in a variety of written ways suitable to the assessment, and may also use the ERTH Self-Evaluation Questionnaire.
- CETL workshops or reviews
- Description of new pedagogical teaching methods, course content, and other substantial improvements made to courses, and, if appropriate, along with reflection on the effectiveness of new content.

- Teaching enhancement plan in consultation with CETL  
<https://cetl.uconn.edu/teaching-enhancementplans/>
- Teaching conferences attended/professional development CETL consultation  
<https://cetl.uconn.edu/consultations/>
- Completion of a “teaching practices inventory”  
<http://www.cwsei.ubc.ca/resources/TeachingPracticesInventory.htm>
- Publications and presentations pertaining to teaching innovations

Finally, additional evidence of effective teaching may include teaching awards, recognition, and nominations from the department, university, or other organizations

## Department SET+ Recommendation

The department recommends an active and up-to-date teaching assessment portfolio. In each year of faculty review, faculty are encouraged to develop a portfolio that includes components from all three categories (peer-review, self-reflection & evaluation, and student evaluation), with a minimum of one (1) evaluation from each category – in addition to SETs. For milestone promotions or reappointment reviews (e.g., 5-year reappointment, promotion to associate of full professor), faculty should complete a minimum of two (2) evaluations from each category (student experience, peer- review, and self-reflection and evaluation) – in addition to SETs.

### Citations

1. AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement  
[https://lr.uconn.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/988/2017/08/AAUP.CBA\\_07.01.17.pdf](https://lr.uconn.edu/wpcontent/uploads/sites/988/2017/08/AAUP.CBA_07.01.17.pdf)
2. Office of the Provost: Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment  
<https://provost.uconn.edu/faculty-andstaff-resources/promotion-tenure-and-reappointment-2/#ptr-18>

### Resources

CETL, UConn SET+ <https://cetl.uconn.edu/set-plus/>

- Aligning Practice to Policy: Changing the Culture to Recognize and Reward Teaching at Research Universities. <https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/STEM-Education-Initiative/Aligning-Practice-To-Policies-Digital.pdf>
- Undergraduate STEM Education Initiative  
<https://www.aau.edu/education-service/undergraduateeducation/undergraduate-stem-education-initiative>

- Gender Bias in Student Evaluations <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/ps-political-science-andpolitics/article/gender-bias-in-student-evaluations/1224BE475C0AE75A2C2D8553210C4E27>

## Department of Earth Sciences End of Semester Student Questionnaire

**Instructions:** Please answer each question using the scale provided below. Note N/A for some questions may be appropriate for some online or distance learning classes.

**Scale:** 1 - Never 2 - Rarely 3 - Sometimes 4 - Often 5 - Always N/A

**Course Questions:** In this course, I was encouraged to:

**Q1** Reflect on what I was learning through effective measures such as homework, exams, and research projects.

**Q2** Connect the learnt concepts with “real world” applications or thought-provoking questions.

**Q3** Work and learn collaboratively with my classmates.

**Q4** Interact with other students in a respectful way

**Q5** Contribute my ideas and thoughts to classroom and/or online discussions.

**Q6** Evaluate arguments, evidence, assumptions, and conclusions about class topics (be a critical thinker).

**Q7** Connect, synthesize, and/or transform ideas into a new form such as class project, research paper, etc.

**Instructor Questions:** In this course, the instructor:

**Q8** Encouraged me through direct interactions (in-person or virtual) and content to further my own knowledge, comprehension, and conceptual understanding.

**Q9** Provided opportunities for me to ask questions and initiate discussion.

**Q10** Provided feedback on my work that helped me improve my performance.

**Q11** Explained the grading criteria for assignments.

**Q12** Was available to answer questions and/or provide assistance to me when needed.

**Q13** Effectively used available technology to enhance learning.

**Q14** Demonstrated respect for diverse points of view on open-ended questions from all students regardless of background including race, ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, gender, ability, body size, religion, and age.

**Comments (if any):**

**Q15** Please offer constructive comments to your instructor on the most effective and/or least effective aspects for your learning in this course.

# Department of Earth Sciences Self-Reflection Questionnaire

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Role: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_ Modality: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Please reflect and answer at least three questions selected from each category (~100-300 words per response suggested). *Note that some questions are not applicable to the teaching modality.*

## **Teaching**

1. How satisfied am I with my teaching of the course?
2. What are the strong points of my teaching in this course? Weak points?
3. What would I change if I taught this course again?
4. What did I find most rewarding about this teaching experience? Most frustrating?
5. What actions have I taken to improve my teaching (from previous semesters and/or throughout the semester)?
6. How might my own cultural-bound assumptions influence my interactions with students?

## **Course Goals**

1. What were my course goals and teaching objectives and why were these selected?
2. Which goals and objectives did and didn't I meet?
3. How might I revise my goals and objectives for this course?
4. Was I able to induct students into research and other forms of active scholarly involvement?
5. Was I able to allow for students to participate in multiple or different ways?

## **Course Content?**

1. How satisfied am I with the assignments, examinations, readings, etc. associated with the course?
2. How might I improve any components of the course content?
3. How do I make sure the course materials stay up to date with the field?
4. How can I modify course materials, activities, assignments, and/or exams to be more accessible to all students in my class?

## **Course Feedback**

1. What strategies did I use to provide feedback to students to help them improve their performance and achieve the intended learning outcomes, and to develop effective skills for lifelong learning?
2. How effective was my feedback to students on their graded materials (i.e., through improved performance on assignments and exams or other metrics)?
3. What do I think of the student evaluations of the course?
4. How will I use the information obtained from grading student assignments to revise my teaching?
5. How will I use the information obtained from student evaluations to revise my teaching?

## Department of Earth Sciences Peer Observation Questionnaire

**Instructor:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Observer:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Course:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Setting** (e.g., classroom, field, laboratory setting): \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Please evaluate each topic below and provide feedback (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, examples) on the effectiveness of the instructor's teaching. *Note N/A if not applicable to the teaching setting.*

<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>Peer observation feedback</b>
Are the learning objectives of the lesson plan clearly identified to the student?	
Are the learning objectives of the lesson plan specific and attainable?	
Do the course activities and/or material presented support the objectives?	

<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>Peer observation feedback</b>
Was the lecture/discussion/lesson plan organized and presented clearly?	
Was the scope/pace of learning content managed effectively?	
Were media/technology or other resources (i.e., rock samples, data) used adequately and appropriately for this content?	

<b>INTERACTION</b>	<b>Peer observation feedback</b>
Were all students encouraged to engage and participate?	
Was the instructor's feedback responsive and informative?	
Did the instructor demonstrate awareness of student engagement and understanding?	

**Summary on the instructional effectiveness of this class: \_\_\_\_\_**

Please provide a summary rating on the instructor's teaching using the ratings outlined below:

- 1 - Weakly effective, with many aspects in need of improvement
- 2 - Mostly effective, with several aspects in need of improvement
- 3 - Effective, with few aspects in need of improvement and continued development
- 4 - Very effective, with minor aspects for improvement and continue development

**Add any comments that you wish to convey to the instructor:**

**Special classification notes:** (e.g., type of class, class size)

**Optional: Evaluation of specific course materials:** (e.g., syllabus, exams, readings, assignments)

**Faculty signature:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Observer Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



## DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS IN EARTH

This document outlines processes for the selection and review of departmental administrative positions held by faculty.

### **Associate Department Head**

In EARTH, the Associate Department Head (AH) performs the role filled by the Department Advisory Committee in larger departments, which is to advise the Head. Duties include performing the Head's duties in the Head's absence. Other duties will be determined in consultation with the Head, and will vary depending on interest and expertise.

**Selection Procedure:** The AH is appointed by the Head.

**Review Procedure:** The AH duties are considered as part of the Service workload, and so are considered in merit assessments. The EARTH Merit Advisory Committee may provide feedback during the merit process. The AH meets annually with the Head to reflect on the past year, considering what worked well and what did not. The Head shall also provide specific feedback as part of the annual performance review.

**Term:** Annual and renewable, with no set term limit.

### **Graduate Coordinator**

The Graduate Coordinator (GC), who is also normally the Geosciences Field of Study representative to the Graduate School, chairs the EARTH Graduate Committee. The GC leads the committee in a number of tasks, including initial screening of applications to the Graduate Program; creating opportunities for faculty input to the admissions process; making recommendations of candidates for admission; advising the Head for filling Research Assistant and Teaching Assistant positions; advising the Curriculum and Courses Committee of any curricular needs for graduate students; advising the Head on the content and staffing of the graduate Core Course or alternative; providing oversight of the degree progress of the graduate students in the department; maintaining a manual for explaining our rules and expectations for progress toward degree completion, doing an annual evaluation of the department's graduate program in the context of the strategic plans and initiatives for the department, college, and university. The GC also leads the administration and analysis of annual surveys of incoming, continuing and graduating students and maintains current records on each student in the program. Additional charges may be made at the discretion of the Head.

**Selection Procedure:** The GC is appointed by the Head.

**Review Procedure:** The GC duties are considered part of the Service workload, and so are considered in merit assessments. The EARTH Merit Advisory Committee may provide feedback during the merit process. The AH meets annually with the Head to reflect on the past year, considering what worked well and what did

not. The Head shall also provide specific feedback as part of the annual performance review.

Term: Three-year term, renewable.

## **Undergraduate Coordinator**

The Undergraduate Coordinator (UC) chairs the EARTH Undergraduate Committee, and will work closely with our departmental advisor (Program Coordinator). The committee is charged with overseeing the educational experiences of all Geoscience undergraduate students. Activities will be determined by the current needs of the department. Responsibilities include: promotion of, and recruitment to, the Geosciences major (B.S. and B.A. as a first, second, or interdisciplinary major) and minor at the main and regional campuses; helping to coordinate advising within the department, being a liaison for advisors in other programs on campus, notably ACES and the CLAS Advising Center; bringing curricula needs to the Curriculum & Course Committee; monitoring activities of the GeoClub; organizing and hosting events to enhance the undergraduate experience, including the regularly scheduled open houses, the majors fair; and others; evaluating the department's undergraduate program in the context of the department, college and university strategic plans and initiatives; enhancing and marketing the visibility and accessibility of our undergraduate courses, majors, and minors at the main and regional campuses; coordinating with the UConn Center for Career Development; enhancing the diversity and inclusion of under-represented groups; assisting with transfer admissions; and nominating current students for various awards and scholarships.

Selection Procedure: The UC is appointed by the Head.

Review Procedure: The UC duties are considered part of the Service workload, and are considered in merit assessments. The Merit Advisory Committee may provide feedback during the merit process. The UC meets annually with the Head to reflect on the past year, considering what worked well and what did not. The Head shall also provide specific feedback as part of the annual performance review.

Term: 1-3 year term, renewable.