

Department of Geology Policy Manual

28 February 2023

This is a listing of policies voted on and passed by the Geology Faculty. New policies are to be added to this listing by the Parliamentarian within two weeks of their passage.

Table of Contents

Selection of Candidates for Department Head	2
Course Challenge Policy	3
Graduate Program Faculty Guidelines	4
Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure	7
Review of Tenured Faculty	12
Third-year Review of Non-tenure-track Faculty	13
GRE Requirement	14
Annual Review Requirement	15
Supplement to Annual Review Requirement	20
Student Success Activities	24
Student Awards	28

Selection of Candidates for Department Head

23 January 2023

The Committee on Committees will select a committee of three faculty members who will solicit nominations for Department Head. This selection committee will be chaired by a person chosen by the Dean of Franklin College. The selection committee should be diverse in terms of faculty ranks, gender, ethnicity, and area of interest within the department.

The selection committee will solicit nominations for Department Head and make those nominations known to the Department and the Dean. These candidates will make a short written or oral presentation to the faculty that establishes their qualifications and goals as Department Head. Following these presentations and a period of questions from the Faculty, the Faculty will vote for their preferred candidate for Department Head. The selection committee will convey the results of this vote to the Dean.

see: [https://franklin.uga.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Senate Bylaws_revised Nov 4 2022.pdf](https://franklin.uga.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Senate%20Bylaws_revised%20Nov%204%202022.pdf)

Course Challenge Policy

date unknown

The Department of Geology does not allow course challenges at either the undergraduate or graduate level.

Graduate Program Faculty Guidelines

January 2019

A. Qualifications for Membership in the Graduate Program Faculty

The principal intellectual criteria for membership in the Graduate Program Faculty (GPF) are:

1. Doctorate or highest earned terminal degree in Geology or a related discipline, or equivalent professional experience
2. Proficiency in conducting scholarly research and/or practice of the profession
3. Proficiency in supervising scholarly research or practice of the profession
4. Non-tenure track faculty can be appointed to the GPF if appropriate.

All appointments to the Geology GPF will be in accordance with the UGA Faculty Credentials for the Instructor of Record policy, as set out by the Office the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

B. Responsibilities and Rights of the Graduate Program Faculty Only Graduate Program Faculty can:

1. Serve as major professor for doctoral students
2. Serve as major professor for Master of Arts and Master of Science students
3. Serve on Graduate Council
4. Vote for members of Graduate Council
5. Vote for appointment/ reappointment/ removal/ revocation of Graduate Program Faculty in their unit
6. Vote for modification of GPF guidelines.

C. Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Graduate Program Faculty

1. Graduate Program Faculty will be appointed at the Geology Department level.
2. The criteria for appointment and reappointment are as described in Section A.
3. Tenure and tenure-track faculty will be evaluated for Graduate Program Faculty status when a vote for appointment to a tenure or tenure-track faculty position is held. Following a vote in favor of appointment to a tenure or tenure-track faculty position, the Graduate Program Faculty will vote on appointment to the Graduate Program Faculty.
4. Faculty members with professional, career, adjunct, or non-tenure track faculty appointments, or retired Graduate Program Faculty members, may be appointed to the Graduate Program Faculty by a vote of the Graduate Program Faculty. Such faculty members will provide a current curriculum vita along with other materials as appropriate to the Graduate Program Faculty for evaluation. Such appointments will be for five-year terms. Retired faculty members may serve out their five-year term as Graduate Program Faculty.
5. Tenure-track faculty will be considered for reappointment to the Graduate Program Faculty at the time of Post-Tenure Review, or at the time of consideration for promotion or tenure. Following a vote on Post-Tenure Review or promotion or tenure, the Graduate Program Faculty eligible to vote on the Post-Tenure Review or the vote on promotion or tenure, will vote on reappointment to the

Graduate Program Faculty. Non-tenure track faculty will be considered for reappointment to the Graduate Program Faculty every five years, and all Graduate Program Faculty with full-time UGA appointments will vote on the reappointment. Votes may be held electronically. A simple majority vote is required for appointment or reappointment.

6. Faculty members will be required to submit a current CV prior to a vote on appointment or reappointment to the Graduate Program Faculty.

7. If the Geology Department faculty votes in favor of promotion or of the award of tenure to a member of the Graduate Program Faculty, the faculty member will be reappointed as a member of the Graduate Program Faculty until the time of the next Post-Tenure Review or vote on promotion or tenure.

8. Faculty members will be notified of consideration for reappointment to the Graduate Program Faculty when they are notified of their Post-Tenure Review in the case of tenure-track faculty, or during their fifth year of membership in the case of non-tenure track faculty.

9. Appointments and Reappointments (with votes) will be reported to the college (not the Graduate School). The college will furnish the names of Graduate Program Faculty members to the Graduate School. Dates will be included in the Dean's Calendar.

10. A faculty member can appeal a negative vote for appointment or reappointment to the Graduate Program Faculty. Such an appeal should be initiated by a letter to the Department Head. This letter should clearly state the grounds for appeal. The faculty member should provide any additional documentation to be considered with the appeal. The appeal letter and supporting documentation will be available to the Graduate Program Faculty for review. The Department Head will convene a meeting of the Graduate Program Faculty to vote on the appeal.

11. The Department Head shall notify the faculty member within 30 days of the vote on the appeal of the outcome of the vote.

12. A faculty member may further appeal to the Dean of the Franklin College or to the Appeals Committee of the Graduate Council. The Dean of the Franklin College and the Appeals

Committee shall determine the procedures for such an appeal.

D. Revocation of Graduate Program Faculty Status

A member of the Graduate Program Faculty of the Franklin College may have their Graduate Program Faculty status removed if they fail to meet any or all of the expectations outlined above, as assessed during the periodic review process. It is also possible for a member of the Graduate Program Faculty to have their Graduate Program Faculty status revoked by the Dean of the Franklin College, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Provost, or the President outside the periodic review process. Revocation may occur for egregious acts (including violations of the institution's NDAH policy) or when a faculty member fails to fulfill the responsibilities of a member of the Graduate Program Faculty to teach graduate student(s) effectively, in a civil, professionally appropriate manner, to do scholarly research and creative work of high quality or remain active in the practice of the profession, and to direct the research/professional development of graduate student(s) so that they progress toward graduation in a timely manner appropriate to the field. Failure to teach graduate students effectively and/or to direct the research and professional development of graduate student(s) also includes, but is not limited to, abuse of power, intimidation and harassment, and violation of work place violence policies. For a full listing of the procedures, see Revocation of Graduate Program Faculty Status at the Graduate School website (<https://>

grad.uga.edu/graduate-bulletin/graduate-program-faculty-information/revocation-of-graduate-program-faculty-status/ as of 25 January 2023)

Faculty found in violation of UGA non-discrimination or anti-harassment regulations will jeopardize their graduate faculty status.

Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

March 31, 2015

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Geology Department will carefully follow and adhere to the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's Guidelines. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this PTU document and the University Guidelines. If an inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's Guidelines will supersede this document.

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Geology, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

Advisement: At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document and the most recent version of the University Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and will be advised in writing about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure. He or she will sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

For each assistant professor, the head will appoint a senior faculty mentor who will advise on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion and tenure. If the assistant professor is not satisfied with the mentor, he or she may request that the mentor be replaced and the head will appoint a new mentor.

Annual evaluation: Every tenure-stream faculty member will receive a written evaluation from the department head on an annual basis. At the end of each calendar year, the department head will solicit from each faculty member a report of their professional activities in instruction, research, and service covering the twelve-month period that concludes on December 31. The department head will evaluate performance of a faculty member relative to the standards for their rank, expressed below in the section Criteria for the Ranks. For assistant and associate professors, the review will provide an assessment of their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Each faculty member will be afforded the opportunity to meet individually with the department head to discuss the written review, during which they may propose changes or additions to the document. The document will be signed by both the faculty member and department head. Performance reviews are generally concluded by the end of February each year.

Third-year review: In the spring of the third year each assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in the Guidelines. It is recommended that the CV provided for the third-year review be in the promotion dossier format as described in the Administrative Guidelines of the Provost's website http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/admin_guidelines. The department head or an assigned faculty mentor will advise the faculty member on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

At the same time, the department head in consultation with the faculty member, will appoint a committee of three faculty to review the faculty member's dossier and performance. For assistant professors, the mentor will serve as a member of this committee. This committee will review research publications and efforts to acquire outside funding, visit several classes, read through

teaching evaluations and other evidence of performance in instruction. On the basis of this review, the committee will write a report that presents in detail its finding and that makes clear recommendations to the candidate concerning his or her progress towards promotion. In particular the report will address the question of whether the candidate is progressing in a satisfactory way towards meeting departmental criteria for promotion and tenure. A copy of the report will be given to both the candidate and the department head.

At a regular departmental meeting with a quorum of eligible faculty present, the head will present the report to the faculty. (The Guidelines define faculty eligibility). The faculty will then discuss and vote on the following two questions:

- 1) “[Candidate’s name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor.”
- 2) “[Candidate’s name] should be renewed for the fourth year.”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on these questions.

The committee conducting the third-year review will provide a copy of the review report to the department head and the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to provide a written response to the review, and this response will be made available at the faculty meeting at which votes on the report and renewal of the candidate are taken.

The department head will provide the candidate with a written report of the departmental vote.

Preliminary Consideration: The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in section VI C of the Guidelines. In the spring of the appropriate year, by the deadline of March 1, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will communicate this wish in writing to the department head.

The candidate will by the March 1 deadline present a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in Appendix C of the Guidelines, plus copies of all publications and other supporting documentation to the department head. Faculty eligible to vote on this candidate will review these materials. At a meeting of eligible faculty held by April 15, the faculty will vote on the following question:

“[Candidate’s name] should be formally reviewed for promotion to the [next rank] and/or for tenure.”

Faculty will vote “Yes” or “No” on this question. The results will be conveyed by the head in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote. In accordance with the Guidelines, candidates who receive a majority of “Yes” votes on this question and who wish to be formally reviewed for promotion and/or tenure will work with the department head or an appointed senior mentor to prepare the dossier.

Formal Review: In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the Guidelines. In addition, the candidate will make available by August 1 a dossier equivalent to sections 4 and 5 of the promotion dossier described in Appendix C of the Guidelines, plus copies of all publications as well as teaching materials, including student evaluations, syllabi, and other evidence pertaining to teaching. Student letters may be submitted if solicited by the department head from a list made available by the candidate. All evaluations for all courses taught must be submitted to the head. Articles or books that have been accepted but not published may be submitted if accompanied by a letter of formal acceptance. Unaccepted books or articles may not be submitted or included on the vita. Copies of all published items listed on the vita, along with other materials

prepared for the dossier, including the external letters of assessment, must be made available to the department by August 1.

The faculty will meet by or on September 1 to discuss the credentials and vote on a recommendation. Following the vote on each candidate the head will announce how he/she voted.

Requests for reconsideration by candidates who do not receive a positive recommendation must be handled in accordance with the Guidelines.

Criteria for the Ranks

Tenure and for Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure and for promotion to associate professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.

Teaching: On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the candidate must show clear excellence as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in limited direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students.

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Research: In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for tenure and promotion has typically:

- (a) published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of her/his independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;
- (b) demonstrated the ability to obtain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of her/his independent research program. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the candidate is the Principal or co-Principal Investigator.

Successful candidates will generally have a record that approximates or exceeds these departmental expectations. In rare cases, should the candidate fall significantly short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for tenure and promotion. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of excellence of the candidate's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the candidate's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

If the department hires a faculty member whose research will result in different kinds of research productivity that are not included above, the department and the candidate must agree in writing at

the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement.

Service: Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or for tenure are expected to attend departmental meetings, have some limited service on student and departmental committees, and, if asked to serve, limited service on campus committees and governing bodies. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Participation or leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Promotion to Professor

For promotion to full professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Teaching: On the basis of student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the candidate must show clear excellence as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students.

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Research: In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for tenure and promotion has typically:

(a) published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year for a period of at least four years immediately prior to consideration, in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of her/his independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections;

(b) demonstrated the ability to maintain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of her/his independent research program prior to consideration. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the candidate is the Principal or co- Principal Investigator.

Successful candidates will generally have a record that approximates or exceeds these departmental expectations. In rare cases, should the candidate fall significantly short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for tenure and promotion. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of excellence of the candidate's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the candidate's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

Service: Successful candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Review of Tenured Faculty

April 1997

The University of Georgia's "Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty" passed by the University Council January 14, 1997, delegates the development of two policy issues to the respective promotion/tenure units: (1) the process for selecting the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and (2) the specific criteria and expectations for a satisfactory review. In addition, the policy does not specify the schedule by which the current backlog of tenured faculty will be reviewed, though the administration has recommended that 20% of these faculty members be reviewed each year. The Department of Geology therefore has developed these department-specific policies with regard to these issues.

Addendum to III. B. - Selection of the Post-Tenure Review Committee:

Each faculty member being reviewed selects an Advocate from among the tenured faculty within the Department. The Advocate will be responsible for facilitating the construction of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The faculty member being reviewed supplies the Advocate with a list of at least 5 tenured faculty members suggested for service on their Committee. The Advocate will then establish a committee of 3 from the list; the Advocate may also serve on the Committee. The Committee will then select its own Chair from among its membership. If 3 faculty members from the original list are not willing or eligible to serve then the Advocate will solicit additional names from the faculty member being reviewed. Once selected, the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall proceed with the review as specified in Section III. C. of the University's policy.

Addendum to III. D. - Criteria for a Satisfactory Review

The Department of Geology expects continued quality contributions toward the University's missions in teaching, research, and service, depending on the contractual obligations of the individual faculty member. In addition, the Post-Tenure Review Committee should consider meritorious the contributions of tenured faculty to university governance, interdisciplinary programs, administration and other programs outside the Promotion/Tenure Unit. The Committee shall provide a "concise, written summary of the review" as specified in Section III. D. of the University's policy.

Departmental Policy for Reviewing the Current "Backlog" of Tenured Faculty

The Department of Geology will follow the recommendation of the administration that 20% of faculty tenured for more than 5 years be reviewed each year. The Department therefore shall review two such faculty members per year for the next three years unless this review is supplanted by another comprehensive review as specified in Section III. A. of the University's policy. Volunteers from among eligible faculty will be reviewed first followed by those who have been tenured the longest and for whom it has been at least 5 years since their last comprehensive review.

Add policy on third-year review of non tenure-track faculty
?February 2022

GRE Requirement

26 October 2020

The Department of Geology will no longer require or accept scores from the GRE exam on applications for graduate studies effective immediately.

Annual Review

21 November 2022

Annual evaluations that align with USG and UGA policy include the following forms of evidence:

Outputs: Outputs are evidence that the faculty member is carrying out their work as assigned. Example outputs include explicit targets for activities related to each scope of work (e.g., number, type, or pattern of scholarly engagement or products consistent with discipline/subdiscipline, number of courses taught, expectations for committee membership, number of research mentees) along with indicators of the workload associated with each activity (e.g., whether a course has high enrollment or is writing intensive, whether the committee or committee role involves higher or lower workload such as serving as chair).

Quality and impact: While outputs are important for providing evidence of workload, evidence of the quality and impact of the work provides insight into how well the work was done and what difference the work made. Indicators of quality and impact are important for demonstrating teaching, research, and service excellence for promotion and tenure.

Example evidence of quality and impact of research/scholarship/creative work can include the profile of where the work is presented or shared (e.g., reputation of the journal, conference, or other event), and reach of the venue where the work is presented or shared (e.g., audience number, audience diversity in terms of discipline, communities, geography, etc.).

Professional development: USG and UGA policies emphasize the importance of professional development in all domains of faculty work. Evidence of professional development includes participating in learning opportunities that the faculty member strategically selects in order to improve their work as needed, as well as application of lessons learned as a result of professional development. Example evidence of teaching professional development can include participation in workshops accompanied by brief, narrative descriptions (e.g., teaching self-reflections) of how lessons learned were applied and what outcome(s) resulted. Example evidence of research professional development can include attending workshops on writing, grant development, and project development, engaging in networking events, and providing brief, narrative descriptions of sharing drafts of scholarly works in progress and how improvements were made based on feedback from colleagues. Example evidence of service professional development can include participation in relevant workshops and brief, narrative descriptions of feedback gathered from stakeholders for how to improve the operations or functions of the committee and how feedback was addressed.

Objectivity or bias mitigation: To promote fairness and equity and reduce potential for bias, annual evaluations should rely on multiple pieces of evidence based on established approaches to evaluating quality and impact of the work in the field or discipline. For each domain of work (teaching, research, service), there should be more than one piece of evidence presented. For instance, publication expectations (outputs) could be accompanied by evidence of the quality and impact of each publication, such as narrative description of the journal's reputation or reach and inclusion of altmetrics). Numbers of proposals submitted could be accompanied by a brief, narrative description of steps taken to improve fundability, such as how advice was sought on drafts and what steps were taken to revise based on feedback. Regarding teaching, student experience survey results (i.e., end-of-course surveys) should be accompanied by at least one other form of evidence, such as self-reflection that describes the collection and analysis of data (e.g., exam or assignment scores, recurrent themes in student survey responses, peer observation results), teaching decisions made based on the data, or steps for evaluating the effects of the change(s). Indicators of the quality and impact of work should align with what is expected in the field. For instance, the

number of research and teaching activities and indicators of quality and impact should be evaluated with respect to standards for the faculty member's position, rank, and discipline/sub-discipline.

Although annual evaluations occur on a yearly basis, evaluation results may be best considered on a longer timeframe, such as a three-year window. A longer evaluation timeframe accommodates teaching responsibilities that may vary year to year and the dynamicity from year to year of research, creative, and scholarly activities.

The following table is an annual evaluation rubric. Explicit expectations for outputs should be defined by the unit based on standards in the discipline or subdisciplines (this may vary within the unit) and for the rank, position type, and workload allocation.

	Research	Teaching	Service
1: Does not meet expectations	Outputs fall short of targets defined in supplement No indicators of quality/impact are included	Courses/student-hours taught, students advised falls short of targets defined in supplement No evidence of quality/impact is provided No evidence of effort to improve teaching	Information provided is insufficient to evaluate service efforts as defined in supplement Service responsibilities are listed, without information about contributions, quality, or impact
2: Needs improvement	Outputs meet targets defined in supplement but do not include indicators of quality/impact Outputs and indicators of their quality/impact are included but fall short of targets defined in supplement	Courses/student-hours taught, students advised meet targets defined in supplement but do not include indicators of quality/impact or descriptions of improvement efforts Indicators of quality/impact rely on only one source of evidence Narrative describes minimal effort made to improve teaching	Service responsibilities fall short of targets defined in supplement (e.g., insufficient national service, insufficient contributions to local committee work) No evidence of effort to improve service

3: Meets expectations	<p>Outputs meet targets defined in supplement regarding publications, proposals/ grants and/or presentations or other forms of research / scholarship / creative work such as projects, collaborations, or other forms of research/creative/ scholarly engagement</p> <p>Quality/impact: narrative describes the reputation, reach, or other impact of the research / scholarly / creative product/progress that aligns with desired level of quality and impact defined in supplement</p> <p>Professional development: narrative describes good effort to improve research/ scholarly progress/products as needed</p>	<p>Outputs meet targets defined in supplement regarding courses / student-hours taught, students advised, with some accounting for workload (e.g., based on enrollment, intro vs. upper division, writing intensity, etc.)</p> <p>Quality/impact: at least two forms of evidence for quality/impact are included (e.g., summary of student experience survey results, narrative description of peer evaluation of teaching, assessment of student learning or growth) (see for examples: https://seercenter.uga.edu/delta-project/resources-for-departments/)</p> <p>Professional development: narrative describes good effort to improve teaching based on peer evaluation, student evaluation, or other evidence from students as needed</p>	<p>Outputs meet targets of service responsibilities defined in supplement at the local (unit, institution) and national/international level, with some accounting for workload (e.g., based on role-associated workload)</p> <p>Quality/impact/ professional development: narrative describes good effort to evaluate service efforts and make improvements as needed (e.g., participating in professional development to improve committee work)</p>
4: Exceeds expectations	<p>Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement</p> <p>Indicators of quality/impact exceed targets defined in supplement</p> <p>Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve research/ scholarly progress/products, as needed</p>	<p>Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement</p> <p>Indicators of quality/impact exceed target by a defined amount / in a defined way(s), such as local awards, evidence of teaching effectiveness and inclusiveness, taking on leadership and/or mentorship roles</p> <p>Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve effectiveness and inclusiveness of teaching, including using multiple forms of evidence to make teaching decisions, enactment and evaluation of teaching changes, and/or seeking relevant professional development to improve as needed</p>	<p>Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement</p> <p>Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve committee functioning, effectiveness, and/or impact and making improvements based on results (e.g., collecting and analyzing data on committee functioning, effectiveness, and/or impact, making improvements based on results)</p> <p>Indicators of quality/impact are included, such as local awards, recognition, internal funding, and/or leadership</p>

5: Exemplary	Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement Indicators of quality/impact exceed target defined in supplement Ambitious effort to improve the quality and impact of research/scholarly progress/products.	Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement Indicators of quality/impact exceed targets by a defined amount / in a defined way(s), such as scholarship of teaching, teaching grants received, extensive application of evidence-based teaching, national/international awards, recognition, and/or high-level leadership Ambitious effort has been made to improve effectiveness and inclusiveness of teaching as needed, including all of the following: using multiple forms of evidence to make teaching decisions, enactment and evaluation of teaching changes, and professional development to improve	Outputs exceed targets defined in supplement Narrative describes ambitious effort to improve committee functioning, effectiveness, or impact and making improvements based on results Indicators of quality/impact are included, such as national / international service awards, recognition, external funding, and/or high-level leadership
--------------	---	--	---

Student Success Activities

Submitted materials document involvement in Student Success Activities as appropriate to the discipline, assigned effort, and area of effort (teaching, research, service, and/or administration):

yes ___ no _____

Narrative describes good effort to implement at least 1 student success activity in ways that are consistent with its effectiveness:

yes ___ no _____

Overall Evaluation:

- 1: Does not meet expectations
- 2: Needs improvement
- 3: Meets expectations
- 4: Exceeds expectations
- 5: Exemplary

The overall evaluation is the rating in each category multiplied by the percentage of effort the faculty member is to allocate toward that category. The resulting values are then summed to give a total rating. Ratings are rounded following standard conventions (i.e., tenths digit <5, round down; if tenths digit is ≥5, round up). If student success activities have not been documented as described above, the overall rating drops by one level.

Example calculation: Professor ABC earns a 5 rating for research and a 2 rating for teaching, and they have a 67/33 split of research and teaching responsibilities. This amounts to a contribution of 3.35 for research (5×0.66) and a 0.66 for teaching (2×0.33), for an overall evaluation rating of 4.01, which is rounded to a 4. Professor XYZ earns a rating of 3 for research (3×0.5) and 4 for teaching (4×0.5) and has a 50/50 split, for an overall evaluation of 3.50, which is rounded to a 4.

Supplement for Annual review criteria

November 21, 2022

In all matters related to annual review, the Geology Department will carefully follow and adhere to the University of Georgia Guidelines. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement the rubric for annual evaluations

Annual evaluation: Every tenure-tracked and instructor faculty member will receive a written evaluation from the department head on an annual basis. At the end of each calendar year, the department head will solicit from each faculty member a report of their professional activities in instruction, research, and service covering the twelve-month period that concludes on December 31. The department head will evaluate performance of a faculty member relative to the standards for their rank, expressed below in the section for ranks. For assistant and associate professors, the review will provide an assessment of their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Each faculty member will be afforded the opportunity to meet individually with the department head to discuss the written review, during which they may propose changes or additions to the document. The document will be signed by both the faculty member and department head. Performance reviews are generally concluded by the end of February each year.

Criteria for tenure track ranks

Instructors

Indicators of effectiveness in teaching, service, and professional development is the same as those for Lecturers.

Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer

Indicators of effectiveness in each category (teaching, service, and professional development) listed in the criteria for successful annual review in the Lecturer ranks.

Teaching: Based on student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the faculty member must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Faculty members whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Service: Successful faculty members for annual review will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Assistant Professor

Individuals must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.

Teaching: Based on student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the faculty member must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, in limited direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Faculty members whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Research: In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for evaluation has typically:

(a) Published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of her/his independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications. Online publications count equally with print publications, provided they appear in recognized and professionally refereed collections.

(b) Demonstrated the ability to obtain funding at a level appropriate for long-term support of their independent research program. Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the faculty member is the principal or co-principal investigator.

Successful reviews will generally have a record that approximates departmental expectations. In cases, should the faculty member fall significantly short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for a successful annual review. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of effectiveness of the faculty member's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the faculty member's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

If the department hires a faculty member whose research will result in different kinds of research productivity that are not included above, the department and the faculty member must agree in writing at the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the faculty member must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement.

Service: Successful associate professors seeking a successful annual review are expected to attend departmental meetings, have some limited service on student and departmental committees, and if asked to serve, limited service on campus committees and governing bodies. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Participation or leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Associate Professor

Reviews must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Teaching: Based on student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the faculty member must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Faculty members whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems, and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Research: In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for annual review has typically:

- (a) Published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year for a period of at least four years in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of their independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications.
- (b) Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the faculty member is the principal or co-principal Investigator.

Successful faculty members will generally have a record that approximates departmental expectations. In cases, should the faculty member fall significantly short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for tenure and promotion. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of effectiveness of the faculty member's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national recognition of the faculty member's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

Service: Successful faculty members for annual review will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Professor

Reviews must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. They should demonstrate national and international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

Teaching: Based on student evaluations, peer reviews, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, improvements in the learning environment and curriculum, the faculty member must show clear effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom, in student advisement, direction of graduate student work and of independent studies or internships, and in other forms of instruction involving students. Faculty members whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must also be able to document steps they have taken to correct these problems,

and the record must reflect, in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, and other means, that significant improvement has occurred.

Research: In the discipline of geology, standard metrics used to measure research performance include the development of an independent research program, research publications, and external research funding. A geology faculty member who is successfully considered for a successful annual review has typically:

(a) Published, on average, 1.5 research publications per year for a period of at least four years, in high quality peer-reviewed journals with national or international recognition. These publications should primarily describe the results of their independent research program. Books, book chapters, edited or co-edited collections of articles, reviews, or awarded patents may substitute for some of the publications and professionally refereed collections.

(b) Funding is expected to include at least one nationally competitive research grant for which the faculty member is the principal or co-principal investigator.

Successful faculty members will generally have a record that approximates or exceeds these departmental expectations. In cases, should the faculty member fall significantly short in a single area, other compensatory measures could substitute in demonstrating qualification for a successful annual review. For example, fewer publications of exceptional demonstrated quality or exceptional national or international recognition should be considered as demonstrations of effectiveness of the faculty member's performance.

In addition to these metrics, evidence of the impact and emerging national and international recognition of the faculty member's research in the form of external assessments, reviews, citations, or awards, is essential.

Service: Successful faculty members for annual review will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Student Success Activities

November 2022

As specified in University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3, Additional Policies for Faculty, teaching faculty reviews, including annual evaluations, third-year review, and post-tenure review, as well as University and discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure, shall include evaluation of teaching faculty members' involvement in student success activities.

Student success activities is a comprehensive term for teaching faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Student success is supported by in class as well as outside of class efforts. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated upon additional allocation of effort but is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable. Units are responsible for further specification of student success activities in their criteria for all review processes as relevant to their disciplines and practices.

Consistent with the USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, Section 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems, and recognizing that faculty members can promote student success in a variety of ways, assessment should focus on documenting a faculty member's quality involvement in a small number of student success activities to maximize effectiveness and engagement.

Geology student success activities may include but are not limited to the following:

- **Teaching and student success activities:** Mentoring and advising of undergraduate, graduate students, and professional students; organizing and attending study groups; supervising independent study; course development, including experiential learning activities and active learning courses; developing, supervising, or managing internships or practicum opportunities.
- **Research and student success activities:** Mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, professional students; directing undergraduate research; co-authoring or co-presenting with students; sponsoring students to attend professional meetings and conferences.
- **Service and student success activities:** Sponsoring coffee hours/social events; sponsoring study abroad programs; sponsoring professional development activities for students (e.g., skills workshops); nominating students for awards; serving as faculty advisor for student clubs/organizations; course and career advising; preparing letters of recommendation and assisting with applications; supporting student recruitment and retention; graduate student professionalization; student care and outreach; student health and wellness
- **Administration and student success activities:** Support for curriculum development; student advising; course scheduling and development of academic calendar, policies, and student support

UGA Policies and Guidelines, as well as Geology policies, guidelines, and criteria, applicable to teaching faculty should reflect the expectation of involvement in student success activities.

The following is an expanded but not exhaustive list of success activities.

Teaching

In-class Examples

- Developing new courses
- Inclusion of career center modules in course materials

- Group activities that teach working together
- Review sessions for class
- Incorporating peer mentors into the classroom
- Teaching skills (e.g., data analysis, research design, writing-intensive projects)
- Required conferencing with each student at the midterm point in the semester to discuss final paper topics and getting started
- Hands on experience with equipment and instrumentation that is industrially relevant
- Working with students as graders
- Recording new videos and course materials for existing courses to assist with retention
- Using evidence-based teaching strategies that are demonstrated to improve conceptual learning and retention
- Small-group instruction during class, facilitated by a circulating instructor, which builds class community and creates learning opportunities
- Writing-intensive best practices, as defined by WIP program
- Using a learner-center syllabus
- Using active learning and student engagement strategies in class (fostering inclusive discussions, formative assessments, group work, classroom assessment technique structures)
- Using Transparency in Teaching and Learning methods
- Scaffolding big assignments
- Providing timely feedback using rubrics
- Having students turn in draft essays, providing feedback, then grading the revised student essays
- Sponsoring/mentoring experiential and service learning for students
- Experiential learning activities that include service learning and applying course content in contexts beyond the classroom

Out-of-class Examples

- Mentoring
- Advising
- Office hours mentoring students
- One-on-one meetings with every student
- Discussing mental health
- Independent study
- Supervising teaching assistants (gas or undergraduate learning assistants) Internships (supervision of, making placements)
- Study abroad
- Guest lectures at UGA
- Volunteer experiences
- Service learning
- Field trips to museums or the field
- Student groups outside of class to learn about a topic/skill in depth
- Facilitating or participating in teaching workshops or fellowship programs
- Performing teaching observations or midsemester formative evaluations for other faculty
- Hosting and leading book discussions with the honors college
- Engage at-risk students (First Generation, vets, etc.) in “instructional coach” and “mentoring”
- Assisting with trouble shooting projects outside of regular class hours
- Successful performance and juries meeting the expectations set by performing faculty
- University non-resident instruction across the state in various learning environments with students from high-school to adult
- Faculty observation of graduate student teaching
- Faculty mentorship of graduate TAs for large lecture sections

Research

- Co-authorship of research papers
- CURO student research

- Conducting educational research projects
- Collaborative research projects with undergraduate students, including conference presentations
- Thesis, dissertation direction & committee service
- Lunch and learns discussing faculty research open to all students
- Visiting scholars and guest speakers who are researchers
- Opportunity to participate in research through GRA, CURO, etc.
- Research feedback and mentoring
- Resume and career advice
- Practice sessions for conference presentations
- Networking/mentorship at conference
- Scholarship interview committees/preparation
- Organize sessions that bring panels of alumni to campus to facilitate alumni mentoring of students
- Bringing/sponsoring students for academic conferences for research presentations and mentoring
- Mentoring and training students assigned to me (or hired by me) as research assistants, both graduate and undergraduate
- Lab tour to students
- Recruiting undergraduate researchers
- Giving presentations on exciting research topics at an accessible level to clubs and other groups
- Successful completion of honor theses, graduate theses as major advisor
- Helping students conduct independent research
- Conducting research side-by-side with students, involving mapping research projects, collecting and cleaning data, writing up results, and polishing manuscripts
- National scholarship competition advisor
- Writing retreats
- Patent application with students
- Involving students in grant writing
- Involving students in grant projects
- Mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in the laboratory
- Mentoring Ph.D. and M.S. students on conference papers (ones that are co-authored with them and ones published by the students on their own)
- Publishing with Ph.D. and M.S. students (including helping them draft early versions of papers, editing various drafts, assisting them in writing revision memos for papers that receiving invitations to revise and resubmit at a journal, making edits for papers that are rejected, etc.)
- Meeting with Ph.D. and M.S. students before they go on the job market to ensure that they are prepared for the rigors and stress associated with this process (i.e., reviewing their job talk papers, attending practice job talks and commenting on their presentations, discussing the professional and social norms associated with interviewing, helping them deal with the stress associated with not getting interviews while others are, etc.)
- Mentoring Ph.D. and M.S. students on their dissertation/thesis s to ensure that they fulfill the departmental and university requirements (i.e., reading various drafts prior to the prospective and dissertation defense, assisting students in finding the necessary data they need to collect for the project, pointing them to the relevant literature or existing studies that they are seeking to build upon)
- Sending students to participate in collaborative campaigns at national labs and R&D units in companies

Service

- Hosting informal gatherings
- Student organizations (advisor)
- Student-led community service activities or community-relevant conferences
- Opportunities for students to help local agencies write grants
- Write letters of recommendation
- Talks/panels for student organization
- Introducing students to potential employers in conferences (e.g., faculty members, researchers in national labs)
- Attending student poster presentations provided by other faculty members at the end of their courses
- Attending job talks to provide feedback for Ph.D. and M.S. students on the market

- Being a guest speaker for a professionalization seminar for students
- Attending volunteer events with students to engage with the community and expand their practical experience.
- Orientation sessions
- Connecting students to alums who are working in their potential career fields.
- Serving on committees related to student success, such as admissions, assessment, curriculum, scholarships.
- Internship speakers
- Teaching basic professional skills
- Industry outreach and field visits coordinated to enhance the learning experience
- Supply and materials donations obtained to enhance the learning experience
- Engaging in student-related diversity, equity, and inclusion activities
- Outreach activity in local K–12 school.
- Exemplify professional conduct
- Being honest, encouraging, empathetic, and professional in all interactions.
- Capstone mentoring
- Arrange mock job interviews
- Referred students to the Office of Student Outreach for their well being
- Scheduling periodic coffee meetings, especially with graduate students
- End of the semester parties
- Discussions about wellness, sharing wellness articles and podcasts
- Check ins during the summer
- Shadowing a professional for a day
- Setting up opportunities for students to meet state agency employees
- Facilitating a volunteer opportunity in a national park for them to learn professional skills
- Work integrated learning opportunities through Discover Abroad
- University publication of outreach materials targeted at specific non-resident student groups attacking field problems, tool use, and knowledge synthesis and support
- University outreach helping adult students navigate various information sources and integrate knowledge bases / sources.
- University training opportunities for non-resident students for continuing education and career advancement
- Including students in the planning of events, seminars, and conferences
- Engaging students to work together with me in the execution of events, seminars, and conferences
- Student recruitment and retention
- Internship coordinator
- Industry liaison for internship and job announcements and career development
- Peer Teaching Evaluation committee
- Scholarship review committee
- Life coaching and career advice
- Sharing information about campus events and resources
- Participate in or organize social events that include students
- Poster or oral competition judging/feedback
- Introduce students to industry partners/future employers

Administrative

- Program accreditation and facilitating continuous curricula improvement for student learning and career success
- Undergraduate Coordinator
- Graduate Coordinator
- Associate Head

Student Awards

25 April 2023

Miriam Watts-Wheeler Scholarship Fund

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for student research support and travel submitted to the Watts-Wheeler Scholarship Fund. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on proposal quality and availability of funds.

The Miriam Watts-Wheeler Scholarships are awarded in the Fall and Spring Semesters and are open to all Geology graduate students. Watts-Wheeler Scholarships are available for travel and for research. Travel grants are intended for travel to professional meetings and conferences to present talks and posters, as well as workshops and training sessions. Research grants are intended to cover research-related expenses, such as sample collection, sample analysis, and fieldwork. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.

Gilles and Bernadette Allard Geology Award Fund

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for student research support and travel submitted to the Allard Funds. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on the proposal quality and availability of funds.

The Gilles and Bernadette Allard Geology Award Fund is awarded in Spring Semester and supports the research of a graduate student whose proposal is primarily for field research. The award is drawn from the pool of qualifying Watts-Wheeler research proposals. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.

Joseph W. Berg Scholarship in Geophysics Fund

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for the Berg award, in consultation with any faculty members that specialize in geophysical research. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on proposal quality and availability of funds.

The Berg Scholarship is awarded in Spring Semester and supports research in geophysics by undergraduate and graduate students. Funds can be used for field expenses, laboratory expenses, and research supplies. For undergraduates, funds may also be used for travel to meetings to present a talk or poster. Undergraduate students may receive a maximum of \$500 during their time in the Department, and graduate students may receive up to \$1500. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.

John Sanford Levy Memorial Fund

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for student research support and travel submitted to the Levy Fund, in consultation with any faculty members that specialize in marine geology. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on proposal quality and availability of funds.

The John Sanford Levy Memorial Fund is awarded in Spring Semester and supports research by graduate students in marine geology. Specifically, this includes the physical, chemical, or biological study of any modern saline depositional environment or any sediment or rock in a saline wetting that requires modern marine technology or logistics during sampling. Eligible areas include marine sedimentology, petrology, geochemistry, geophysics, and studies involving the paleontological, ichnological, and paleoecological implications of modern marine organisms. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.

Paul and Loretha Thiele Graduate Fellowship Fund

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for student research support and travel submitted to the Thiele Graduate Fellowship Fund, in consultation with any faculty members that specialize in clay mineralogy. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on the proposal quality and availability of funds.

The Thiele Graduate Fellowship is awarded in Spring Semester and supports a student studying Clay Mineralogy. The Fellowship may be used for the tuition, living expenses, and other special expenses incurred during graduate study. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.

Oscar Emory Stooksbury Endowed Scholarship in Geology

The Student Award Committee shall review all proposals for student support submitted to the Stooksbury Endowed Scholarship, in consultation with the Undergraduate Advisors. Following the review, the committee will assign specific amounts of funding to each proposal based on proposal quality and availability of funds.

The Stooksbury Scholarship is awarded in Spring Semester. Preference shall be given to students with financial need, as determined by the Office of Student Financial Aid at the University of Georgia. Instructions for application will be maintained on the Departmental website, and announcements of deadlines will be made by the chair of the Student Awards Committee. Funding recommendations are made by the Student Awards Committee, with final approval by the Department Head.