



The University of Georgia®

Department of Computer Science

February 18, 2014

Dr. Silvia Giraudo, Chair of the Executive Committee University Council

The College of Family & Consumer Sciences, CAMPUS

Dear Dr. Giraudo,

1. On 01/27/2014, the Faculty Affairs Committee approved and voted to forward the attached revisions to
 - a) change the titles of UGA non-tenure track research faculty positions,
 - b) change the guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Professors,
 - c) change the Distinguished Research Professor title to Distinguished Professor in Research to the Executive Committee of University Council for consideration and placement on the March 26, 2014 Council agenda.

If you have questions concerning this item, please feel free to contact me by e-mail at thiab@cs.uga.edu

Regards,

Thiab Taha, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee

Tel: 706 542 3455



The University of Georgia

Robert A. Scott
Associate Vice President for Research
rscott@uga.edu

Office of the Vice President for Research
URL: <http://www.ovpr.uga.edu>

604A Boyd Graduate Studies
Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
(706)542-3739
FAX: (706)542-5901

MEMO TO: Prof. Thiab Taha, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee, University Council

CC: Hugh Ruppensburg, Interim Vice Provost
Jayne Smith, Director, Office of Faculty Affairs

FROM: Robert A. Scott

SUBJECT: Request to approve change of titles for non-tenure track faculty research positions and Distinguished Research Professor

DATE: 10 January 2014

Attached to this cover memo is a revised set of Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Research Professors (GAPRP). This memo requests Faculty Affairs Committee approval as the first step toward Council approval of these changes. It also requests a change in the honorary title of Distinguished Research Professor.

In total, there are three related substantive changes that OVPR proposes. All of these have been reviewed by Jayne Smith and Hugh Ruppensburg. Interim Provost Libby Morris has found this proposal to be appropriate for Faculty Affairs Committee review:

1. GAPRP: The titles of Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist will be changed to Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor, respectively;
2. GAPRP: Promotion consideration of Research Assistant Professors will be required after a specified time period in rank and Provost's approval will be required for reappointment at Assistant rank after that specified time period;
3. We propose to change the title Distinguished Research Professor to Distinguished Professor in Research.

The first change is requested based on recommendations from a significant stakeholder review of the OVPR Postdoc Policy. Postdocs who wish to remain at UGA after their five-year training can be appointed as Research Professional (a staff position) or Assistant Research Scientist (a faculty position). Currently, the first is considered a demotion, so almost everyone selects the second even though it is a unit-level position that should be reserved for the best, most independent, postdocs. Our recommended change elevates this position and will be accompanied by a separate change to the staff position title, so that the "normal" route for retaining a postdoctoral scholar will be the staff position. The second change is in recognition of the elevation of this faculty position. We have also added to the guidelines an explicit description of the elevated nature of this position.

The stakeholder review suggested that these title changes are also in line with titles at our peer institutions. We surveyed our comparator and aspirational peer institutions and found this to be true. A solid majority of these institutions use the titles we are proposing (e.g., Ohio State University, North Carolina State University, University of Maryland, University of North Carolina, University of Virginia, University of Michigan, University of Washington).

We also recognized that this new use of Research Professor titles could confound the use of the Distinguished Research Professor honorary title. In fact, many anecdotes suggest that this title is already misunderstood outside UGA. Several Distinguished Research Professors have reported that their non-UGA colleagues assume that this title implies a non-tenure track faculty position. We additionally request a change to the DRP title to avoid this confusion.



Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Research Professors
Effective January 1, 2009
Updated October 2013

1 Background & Definitions

1.1 Definition of Research Professors

The Research Professor faculty track includes the ranks of Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor. Research Professors are non-tenure track faculty positions involved in some aspect of research, research-related instruction, research service, and/or research administration. Research Professors hold the terminal degree appropriate for their discipline and most often have postdoctoral research experience prior to appointment. These guidelines apply equally to part-time and full-time Research Professors.

The Research Professor faculty rank must be distinguished from Research Professionals or Research Scientists, the latter titles being used to classify staff positions (grades I – IV for Research Professionals, grade IV including PhD-level employees).

1.2 Research Professor Internal Titles

Research Professor is the official university faculty title; however, some units may choose more specific titles for internal use. For example, Research Chemist, Research Biologist, Research Geologist, etc., are all informal titles that may be used for internal reference only. These internal titles may not be included on personnel or other official university employment documentation.

1.3 Roles of Research Professors

Research Professors engage in scholarly and creative research appropriate to their field of specialization and to the mission(s) of their particular unit. They are expected to investigate new ideas, to reinterpret established ideas, and to disseminate results of their research through media appropriate to their discipline. These individuals have potential to establish a research program and obtain independent research grants and contracts as principal investigators. They may also be involved with instructional, service, and administrative roles related to research and may apply for Graduate Faculty status to allow them to serve on graduate committees and direct graduate students and postdoctoral scholars. (Note: Research Professors who will be instructor of record must hold the appropriate credentials to teach per UGA Academic Affairs Policy 4.07-13 Faculty Credentials and Institutional approvals for Instructors of Record).

The expertise and contributions of Research Professors have substantial impact on the research enterprise at UGA. In general, they are responsible for creative contributions to their field of specialization. In particular, they contribute to development of laboratory infrastructure by, for example, generating funding, managing projects and resources, students, and staff, and strengthening the overall reputation of the unit via significant scholarly activities such as publications in refereed journals and presentations at meetings. Research Professors charged with managing research service units promote service activities that make the expertise within the university available to external scientists and also strengthen the synergy between industry and the university.

Each **Research Professor** has specific roles and responsibilities reflected in corresponding EFT distributions among research, instruction, service, and administration, all with emphasis on research functions at the university. The positions are not standardized over the entire university, as requirements depend on the needs of the particular unit. Although assignments may differ, each reflects a level of independence and evidence of future trajectory towards national and international recognition. Review of **Research Professor** performance must be based on the specific assignment of duties and EFT distribution.

2 Appointment and Promotion: General Information

2.1 Requirements for Appointment

All provisions of Section 8.3.8 of the Board of Regents' Policy manual apply to the employment of **Research Professors**. In addition, the following stipulations apply:

- A. **Research Professors** must hold the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. This requirement may be waived for individuals with outstanding experience and achievement.
- B. Appointment to and promotion within the **Research Professor** ranks includes consideration of years in rank, levels of experience and accomplishment, degree of independence, evidence of trajectory toward national and international recognition, and impact within one's discipline. Prior service at other colleges/universities or in other related professional activities may qualify for consideration by the appointment/promotion unit in meeting the requirement for years in rank for early promotion but is not automatically applicable.
- C. **Research Professors** are not in a tenure-track position and are not eligible for consideration for the award of tenure or for probationary credit toward tenure for time served in the position.
- D. There shall be no administrative transfers between tenure track and **Research Professor** positions. However, faculty holding one type of position may apply for a declared, open position of the other type and be considered through the normal search and screening process.

Research Assistant Professor. This is primarily an entry-level faculty position. A minimum number of years in a lower rank is not required. Individuals eligible for appointment to this rank should possess strong potential for creative and productive research. In addition, they should show clear potential for obtaining independent research grants or contracts on which they would serve as co-principal or principal investigators.

Research Associate Professor. Under normal circumstances, candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must have had at least four years of experience at the **Research Assistant Professor** level (or equivalent) either at the UGA or another institution. A candidate must have demonstrated consistency and direction in his/her research or research service, and must have achieved a substantial measure of accomplishment or creative contributions in the field of specialization.

Research Professor. An individual would normally be eligible for appointment or promotion to this rank after five years of experience at the **Research Associate Professor** (or equivalent) either at the UGA or another institution. The candidate should clearly be independent and should have achieved strong national and international recognition in the field.

2.2 Compensation Considerations

Appointment to **Research Professor** positions is contingent on the availability of funds for salary. Salary increases comparable to salary increases for tenure-track faculty promotion are expected dependent upon the availability of funds.

3 Appointment Procedures

The procedures to appoint a **Research Professor** should follow the regular faculty appointment process as managed by the Office of Faculty Affairs (<http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/faculty-appointments/>) with the following three exceptions.

1. The Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) reviews and gives preliminary budgetary approval to fill a **Research Professor** position. Please complete OVPR's **Request to Hire a Research Professor** form (found here <http://ovpr.uga.edu/docs/forms/research/Research-Professor-Position-Request.pdf>) and send to OVPR. If the request is for a part-time or temporary position and it is approved, OVPR will assign a tracking number to be used by the appointment unit, which should then conduct the search. If the request is for a regular, full-time position and it is approved by OVPR, OVPR will assign a tracking number and forward to the Provost's Office for final approval. If Provost's approval is obtained, then the form will be returned to the appointment unit.
2. Include the Statement of Roles and Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges in the offer letter in addition to the information required in the Office of Faculty Affairs' faculty offer letter template.
3. The appointment packet for the successful candidate must be sent through the Office of the Vice President for Research for review and approval before going to the Office of Faculty Affairs for final UGA approval.

The following sections outline additional policies and gives guidance to appointment units.

3.1 Appointment Unit

Under usual circumstances, the appointment unit (department, school, college, center, institute, etc.) consists of the eligible voting faculty in the unit, including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at the position's rank or above. If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc appointment unit faculty. If the position will reside in or have a significant relationship with more than one unit, then a combined unit faculty should act as the appointment unit faculty and the heads of all units involved should provide input into the search and appointment processes. In such cases, one unit should be chosen as the administrative unit for the purposes of coordinating evaluations and promotion reviews.

3.2 Search Procedures

To conduct a search for a **Research Professor**, the appointment unit head should appoint a search and screening committee. Members of the search and screening committee should perform their duties according to the UGA Affirmative Action Plan (<http://eoo.uga.edu/affirmativeaction/>). First, they should prepare a Statement of Roles & Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges. The unit should then follow the UGA Faculty Search and Hire Process Checklist available at http://provost.uga.edu/documents/faculty_hire_process_checklist.pdf. In summary, they should:

- Prepare an advertisement including job description based on roles and responsibilities;
- With approval of the appointment unit head and concurrence of the Director of the Equal Opportunity Office, place the advertisement in media appropriate for the discipline;
- Post the position in the USG Applicant Clearinghouse (required for all faculty positions)
- Screen applicants for the position;
- Identify a pool of applicants who are qualified for the position;
- Arrange and conduct interviews, if appropriate, for qualified applicants.

After a 5-year maximum term of appointment as a Postdoctoral Research Associate, a unit may "promote" a Postdoctoral Research Associate to a **Research Assistant Professor** position with evidence of exceptional performance and scholarship and with the following prior approvals: (1) unit faculty approval; (2) appropriate

budgetary approval for the **Research Assistant Professor** appointment; and (3) Equal Opportunity Office approval for the promotional appointment without a search, which requires that the original postdoctoral appointment was the result of a search. After these approvals are received, the unit may proceed with the standard faculty appointment process. Note that research professors are appointed within units (e.g., departments, schools, centers, institutes), not within research groups. Appointment to a Research Assistant Professor position should be reserved for those Postdoctoral Research Associates who are on a trajectory for independent accomplishment. Standard advancement within a research group would usually involve appointment as a Research Scientist (a staff position).

All other **Research Professor** appointments must follow standard UGA faculty hire procedures.

3.3 Unit Definition of Privileges

The **Research Professor** rank is expected to convey privileges on par with those afforded tenure-track faculty and beyond those afforded Research Professionals or Research Scientists. However, the specific privileges may vary with rank and appointment unit. Thus, for each **Research Professor** rank, a Unit Definition of Privileges must be generated to define the exact privileges. The Unit Definition of Privileges may include, but is not necessarily limited to, such things as expectations for attendance at faculty meetings and voting rights with respect to departmental affairs. The Unit Definition of Privileges will be made available to the candidate during the hiring process, and will be included with the offer letter.

Units with **Research Professors** that do not already have this document are strongly encouraged to formulate a Unit Definition of Privileges in consultation with the current **Research Professors** in the unit.

3.4 Statement of Roles & Responsibilities / Effort Distribution

The specific tasks assigned to a **Research Professor** may vary across disciplinary boundaries and academic units. Therefore, it is inappropriate to apply the same criteria used for the evaluation of tenure-track faculty to the evaluation of **Research Professors**. Consequently, a position-specific Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, including explicit expectations for distribution of effort, will be generated for each **Research Professor** position. This Statement will provide the definition against which each **Research Professor** is subsequently evaluated for promotion, and should be created with this in mind. These specific evaluation criteria will be made available to and discussed with candidates during the hiring process, and will be included in the offer letter.

3.5 Selection and Hiring Process / Approval Workflow

Based on recommendations from the search and screening committee, the appointment unit should vote for candidates by secret ballot. The results of this vote should be reported to the appointment unit head and faculty. The unit recommendation is based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The appointment unit head should forward to OVPR an appointment package containing the information described on the Faculty Affairs web site (<http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/faculty-appointments/>). If approved, the package is then forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs for final UGA approval.

4 Annual Evaluations

An annual evaluation of each **Research Professor** will be performed by the appointment/promotion unit head and/or immediate supervisor and documented in a report to be shared with the **Research Professor** and retained by the unit head. The criteria for evaluation should be based on the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities for that particular **Research Professor**, which may have different proportions of research, teaching, service, and administrative responsibilities. The expectations from each of the EFT categories should be directly related to the effort level assigned to each responsibility. Feedback should be provided to the **Research Professor** on work performance and progress toward promotion. Any changes to the **Research Professor's** effort distribution or job description agreed upon during evaluation must be documented in a revised Statement of Roles &

Responsibilities. Immediate supervisors are encouraged to solicit input on performance reviews for **Research Professors**, if they have not already received it. The outcome of the annual evaluation will form the basis for the unit head sending the annual renewal notification letter, consistent with Board of Regents policy (see <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies-procedures/academic/regents-academic-policies/>).

The immediate supervisor and/or the unit head may consider the following factors in evaluating the performance of a **Research Professor** in these areas:

Research Activities. The **Research Professor** should be evaluated annually based on research accomplishments such as publication of articles in scholarly journals, where such articles are subjected to peer review in the discipline. Non-refereed articles and local journals should also be taken into consideration, in addition to books, chapters in books, and monographs published or accepted for publication. The **Research Professor** should demonstrate independence and innovation appropriate to rank through applications for research grants or contracts or support in preparation of such applications. Any papers for presentations whether at national, international or local meetings of professional organizations should be weighted depending on their impact. Any scientific collaboration with universities, research institutes or industry groups outside UGA should be considered.

Teaching/Training Activities. If the **Research Professor** is responsible for teaching or training, student, participant, and/or peer input should be considered in the annual evaluation. The **Research Professor's** effectiveness as a teacher and a mentor, indicated by, for example, student evaluations, course syllabi, course handouts and outlines, or peer reviews should be considered. Where applicable, evidence of the ability to revise and update the course content with new developments in the field should be considered. Similarly where applicable, the **Research Professor** should demonstrate accessibility to students outside the classroom or laboratory setting. If the **Research Professor** supervises graduate students or postdoctoral associates, the ability to guide and mentor these individuals should be considered. The **Research Professor's** role in organizing or teaching workshops/training courses on or off campus should also be considered.

Management/administrative/leadership Activities. If the **Research Professor** has considerable management or administrative responsibilities, the ability to perform as a manager or administrator and the ability to organize and manage a group of people effectively should be considered. Other criteria that could be considered include grant/contract budget management, reporting requirements, and project or facility management. The evaluations should be based on the job description and consider the level of seniority of the position.

Service Activities. The **Research Professor's** contribution to excellence in service should be evaluated based on his/her role to the service being performed and the percentage of effort assigned in his/her job description. The **Research Professor's** role in the day-to-day operation of a service facility as well the ability to work in a group that is designed for offering service whether on or off campus should be considered. The evaluation may consider activities such as improving the service activities, developing and promoting new services, helping to streamline present service activities making them more accessible to potential clients. Any marketing skills such as speaking at conferences, preparing leaflets, fliers, databases, or websites to promote the service mission of the unit should be viewed positively. Indication of successful contributions could include records of how that service is provided and testimony of effective service to a particular client base.

The above are guidelines to evaluate a **Research Professor's** performance, and should not be rigidly or uniformly applied in all situations. The guidelines must be interpreted to fit the circumstances of individual faculty in the various disciplines and departments.

5 Promotion Procedures

Timely promotion consideration is encouraged both to recognize and reward accomplishments, to develop productive **Research Professors** and research units, and to promote career advancement for the benefit of the individual and unit. There is no maximum number of years permissible at any given rank. However, **Research Assistant Professors** in their seventh year at that rank must receive initial consideration for promotion, unless they

explicitly request not to be considered. Once initiated, the candidate can request that the promotion review process be discontinued at any point.

5.1 Promotion Unit

Under usual circumstances, for promotion of a **Research Professor** whose position is within a unit (department, school, college, center, institute, etc.), the promotion unit consists of the eligible voting faculty in the unit, including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at the position's rank or above. If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc promotion unit faculty. If the position resides in or has a significant relationship with more than one unit, then a combined unit faculty should act as the promotion unit faculty and promotion procedures should be coordinated by the head of the chosen administrative unit (see definition of Appointment Unit above).

5.2 Timing of Promotions

Guidelines for promotion criteria as described above (section 2.1) should include consideration of a reasonable schedule of time spent in each rank. Under usual circumstances, promotion to **Research Associate Professor** is considered a minimum of four years after appointment at assistant rank, including the year when promotion will be considered at the University level. Under usual circumstances, promotion to **Research Professor** is considered a minimum of five years after promotion to or appointment at the associate rank, including the year when promotion will be considered at the University level.

Research Assistant Professors entering their seventh year in rank must receive consideration for promotion at the next opportunity, unless they explicitly request not to be considered. Any request to reappoint a Research Assistant Professor beyond seven years, whether it follows unsuccessful promotion or not, must receive prior approval of the Provost. A *reappointment* dossier, similar to the dossier assembled for promotion, must be created and should follow the same approval path as the promotion dossier. Any requests for consideration by Research Assistant Professors who have served beyond the sixth year must be honored.

Generally, in a given year, promotion-related activities should occur within a time frame appropriate for faculty on academic-year schedules to complete the process and for the President to receive the promotion recommendations by a date in January to be determined annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs. This normally dictates a deadline for promotion recommendations to reach the Office of the Vice President for Research on a date in the preceding November.

5.3 Preliminary Consideration

In consultation with the unit head and faculty colleagues, the candidate must initiate a request for consideration to the unit head during spring of the academic year immediately preceding the academic year during which promotion will be formally considered. The purpose of the preliminary consultation is to organize the candidate's dossier and to provide an initial assessment of progress toward promotion.

The candidate will submit a current vita, Statements of Roles & Responsibilities covering the period under consideration, representative contributions, and a two-page summary highlighting accomplishments related to his/her roles and responsibilities. These materials are used for initial review by the promotion unit.

A unit-level committee comprising a minimum total of five tenure-track faculty and/or **Research Professors** at or above the rank being considered must be constituted. The unit-level committee *may* be the same as for academic promotion, or may include members from that committee, *provided* members are familiar with the unique roles and responsibilities of **Research Professors**. The committee must submit a recommendation to support or discourage further consideration to the unit head within three days of preliminary consideration. Within three days of receipt of the preliminary unit-level review recommendation, the unit head must inform the candidate, in writing, of the outcome of the preliminary review.

In the event of a positive recommendation, the unit head will normally solicit the names of 4-6 external reviewers from the candidate and 4-6 external reviewers from the unit **Research Professors** and tenure-track faculty. Under usual circumstances, these reviewers will be external to UGA. The candidate will then prepare and submit all required promotion documentation to the unit head prior to the end of the spring semester.

The unit head will then identify a subset of reviewers. Normally, a total of 6 reviewers will be identified, ensuring representative balance between the candidate and unit nominations. The unit head will submit to the invited reviewers the candidate's current vita, Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, statement of accomplishments, and documentation appropriate to the roles and responsibilities, as gathered for the initial review (see template letter requesting review in Appendix B). In order to ensure balance between candidate- and unit-selected external reviewers, reviewer declinations and non-responses require that additional reviewers be solicited to ensure that a minimum of 4 reviews are included, balancing candidate and unit nominees. All letters of evaluation received must be included in the dossier.

5.4 Documentation

In order to address performance accurately and fairly, the dossier must both clarify the nature of the candidate's roles and responsibilities and document performance related to those roles and responsibilities. Each of the following should be customized to align the candidate's roles and responsibilities with associated performance. A dossier outline is provided in Appendix A.

The curriculum vitae should indicate the EFT distribution throughout the period under review, and emphasize those aspects with greatest relevance to the individual's assignment(s). The assignments may include research, administration, instruction or research training, service, and other responsibilities for which time was allocated, and may vary with changes in roles and responsibilities across the period under review.

The Statement of Roles & Responsibilities that details the candidate's current roles and responsibilities must be included. Changes or significant shifts in roles and responsibilities during the period covered by the evaluation should be identified.

The dossier must also include annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since initial appointment or most recent promotion at the University of Georgia. These annual evaluations detail the candidate's performance during the period under review and should summarize performance based on the candidate's roles and responsibilities.

External assessments are critical to providing balanced and knowledgeable perspectives as to the candidate's performance. Given the importance of accurately aligning the candidate's performance with roles and responsibilities, it is also critical, when soliciting the letters from external reviewers, the unit head should request that external assessments address performance based on the candidate's Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, current vitae, statement of accomplishments, and examples of representative scholarship and quality of performance.

5.5 Promotion Unit Evaluation

The promotion unit provides the initial substantive evaluation of the candidate's performance relative to the criteria for promotion to each rank. Each component of the dossier must be evaluated relative to the candidate's performance of the roles and responsibilities as specified.

A unit-level promotion review committee should be constituted by the promotion unit head. Committee members must be knowledgeable about the **Research Professor's** position and appropriate to evaluating the strength of the **Research Professor** promotion dossier. This committee may consist of the eligible faculty of the unit. The unit head will appoint a chair to oversee committee deliberations and document votes in accordance with the promotion guidelines. The committee will review all dossier documentation, and request further clarification or materials from the candidate or unit head if needed. Individual committee members will cast secret ballot votes to

support or not support the promotion application. Under usual circumstances, committee members will vote "Yes" or "No"; committee members cannot vote "Abstain." A vote to recuse one's self from any participation in the review is allowable only when a conflict of interest exists that would preclude his/her ability to render a fair and objective review of a candidate's request for promotion. Such conflicts of interest may include those individuals who have an intimate relationship with the candidate (such as a spouse) or those with professional/business conflicts of interest. The unit recommendation is based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The committee chair will prepare and send a summary of the vote and deliberations to the unit head for inclusion with the promotion documentation. Where the number of eligible voting faculty members exceeds the membership of the promotion review committee, the recommendation of the committee will then be considered in a vote by all eligible unit faculty members and this latter vote will be included in the promotion documentation. The same rules about conflict of interest and simple majority apply.

The unit head will write a letter summarizing the outcome of the unit-level review, including the vote (Yes, No, Recuse). Should the unit head disagree with a positive unit faculty recommendation, he/she must appoint an alternate proponent to write the cover letter. The letter should address the quality of contributions to the unit and the university, highlight significant contributions/performance, and address the continued importance of the candidate to the unit's and university's strategic mission. The letter should also point to relevant evidence contained in the dossier, and highlight relevant comments from external reviews. The letter should also include the unit head's recommendation to support or not support the promotion application. In drafting the letter, the unit head is encouraged to solicit input from supervisors with direct knowledge of the candidate's performance and contributions.

5.6 University Review

All materials in the promotion dossier should be provided with the unit head letter including a summary of the unit evaluation and vote to the Office of the Vice President for Research by the November deadline published for that year. The OVPR appoints a review committee of tenured faculty and senior **Research Professors** to examine the documentation for each promotion recommendation. Subject to usual conflict of interest recusals, this review committee votes by secret ballot on each recommendation. The university level decision is based upon a simple majority vote of the eligible review committee membership; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The chair of the review committee submits a summary of the deliberations and recommendations to the Vice President for Research, who notifies the candidates of the outcome of the review. All dossiers associated with positive promotion decisions are forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs for final approval by the Provost and President. Negative decisions can be appealed as detailed below.

5.7 Approval Workflow

This checklist provides a summary of the workflow appropriate to the promotion of **Research Professors**. Details of each step have been provided throughout this document.

- Candidate initiates review by notifying promotion unit head
- Candidate collects/generates documentation for initial consideration
- Promotion unit reviews/votes on initial consideration
- Candidate is notified of vote
- Candidate chooses whether to proceed
- Promotion unit head notifies unit faculty of candidate decision to proceed
- If candidate chooses not to proceed, process ends
- Candidate submits names of potential external evaluators
- Promotion unit head solicits names of potential external evaluators from unit faculty
- Candidate prepares complete dossier (Appendix A)
- Promotion unit head selects and requests reviews from external evaluators
- Promotion unit head sends candidate documentation to external reviewers with specific due date (Appendix B)

- Promotion unit head identifies unit evaluation committee members (this may be the entire set of eligible unit faculty members)
- Promotion unit head makes available candidate promotion documentation, including external assessments, to committee
- Promotion unit evaluation committee members convene to review documentation
- Committee chair drafts/submits recommendation (including vote) to promotion unit head
- If necessary, committee recommendation is used to conduct full unit faculty vote
- Promotion unit head notifies candidate of outcome of vote and recommendation
- Candidate chooses whether to proceed
- Unit head (or alternate proponent) writes letter summarizing unit-level evaluation of candidate promotion
- All promotion documentation forwarded to OVPR for university level evaluation
- University evaluation completed
- Chair of university committee submits letter (including vote) to the Vice President for Research summarizing deliberation and recommendation
- Candidate notified of university evaluation vote/recommendation
- Candidate can appeal negative outcome
- Recommendation prepared by the Vice President for Research
- Documentation submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs, Provost, and President for approval

6 Principle of Flow and Appeals

Research Assistant or Associate Professors who receive a negative recommendation on promotion at the unit level may choose to allow the dossier to go forward with the promotion unit recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for Research. This is consistent with the Principle of Flow as defined in the UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Unsuccessful nominations for promotion at the university level may be appealed. Appeal requests should be submitted in writing by the dean/director/department head of the promotion unit to the Vice President for Research within seven days after notification by letter of the candidate's disapproval. The dean/director/department head's appeal request should include a detailed explanation of the relevant circumstances and/or reasons justifying the appeal. This letter of request is the only **new** information allowed in the Appeals Process.

Appeals may be based either on significant inaccuracies in the record of accomplishment by the candidate as submitted in the dossier or on significant procedural irregularities, either in periodic review and advisement of the candidate or in the process of promotion review, as detailed in this document.

The appeal will be submitted to a separate committee appointed by the Vice President for Research and composed of **Research Professors** and Full Professors, who will then make a reappraisal of the candidate's record. The reappraisal will be submitted to the Vice President for Research for a final decision.

7 Other Resources

UGA policies on nontenure-track faculty can be found at <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies-procedures/academic/academic-affairs/1-faculty/103-other-faculty-ranks/>

University System of Georgia Board of Regents policy 803.08:
<http://www.usg.edu/regents/policymanual/800.phtml>

There is more information from the Office of Faculty Affairs at <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/>

Appendix A. Dossier for Promotion of **Research Professors**

The purpose of the dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. It should be prepared in a concise manner. Include only summaries in the dossier. The candidate for promotion should also document his/her most important achievements (see Section 3) and may include a maximum of five exhibits with the dossier to provide detailed evidence of these achievements. The contents and organization of the dossier are described below.

Section 1: **Research Professor** Promotion Summary Sheet

Use the Recommendation for Promotion Form – For Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ranks Only, available on the Faculty Affairs web site (<http://www.uga.edu/provost/facaffairs.htm>).

Section 2: Cover Letter for Promotion

Summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's promotion. Include the information specified below. The cover letter shall be the principal letter of evaluation from the promotion unit.

- A. *Background.* List the candidate's research, creative activities, and efforts in research administration and service since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank. Use the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities to guide the emphasis on particular areas.
- B. *Generalizations About the Candidate's Achievements.* Make generalizations about the candidate's professional accomplishments in areas related to the position. Anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages of the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented.
- C. *Assessment of the Candidate's Stature.* Make generalizations about the candidate's regional, national, or international stature among those of his or her specialty and time within the discipline. Again, anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages in the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented.

Section 3: Vitae

Itemize the candidate's professional activities and attainments as described in these guidelines and relevant to the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities. Identify with an asterisk to the left of the entry those publications, presentations, media, exhibitions, performances, or other accomplishments that are of national or international standing. The candidate should add to the end of the vita no more than two pages of description of the candidate's major accomplishments, assessing the impact of each.

Section 4: Achievements

Describe and document the candidate's achievements since appointment or promotion to present rank in relation to the criteria in these guidelines and the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities. Include data and information summaries where appropriate. Achievements sufficiently documented in Section 3 are preferably referenced by page number rather than duplicated in Section 4.

Use reports from annual evaluations to summarize achievements in all areas of the university's mission (see section 4 of these guidelines) and emphasize those that are relevant to the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities for this position.

Section 5: External Evaluations

Obtain the specified number of letters (section 5.3) from external assessors who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. Briefly state the qualifications for each person evaluating the candidate. Provide the external assessors with the candidate's Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, curriculum vitae, and examples of the candidate's best scholarly works and accomplishments. Obtain letters from disinterested individuals who know the candidate professionally and who are able to judge the candidate's reputation and relative status in the field. Do not solicit letters from the candidate's former major professor, former students, close associates, or friends. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and quality of scholastic achievements; do not solicit supporting letters or personal references. Do not contact anyone the candidate has declared a non-assessor. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's promotion file. Appendix B presents a sample letter format requesting a recommendation for promotion. If necessary, substitute a verbatim transcript of a telephone conversation in lieu of a letter.

Appendix B. Suggested Letter of Request for Evaluation for Promotion of Research Professors

Dear _____:

The University of Georgia is considering the promotion of _____ from _____ to the rank of _____. These are research positions but may also involve assigned effort in instruction/training, service, or administration, related to the research mission of the university. The position of _____ is analogous to that of a _____ on a teaching faculty except that it does not convey tenure. A detailed Statement of Roles & Responsibilities for this particular position is enclosed with this request.

On such promotions we seek expert advice from outside our faculty as well as within it. You have been recommended to us as particularly able to evaluate qualifications for this candidate and this position. We would appreciate your candid opinion of the candidate's qualifications, and any other information you can provide that will help in making a wise decision. We are especially interested in the following:

1. _____'s professional competency.
2. The quality and significance of his/her professional achievements, related to the position description.
3. National reputation and relative standing in his/her field.
4. If your own institution had a position available in the candidate's area of competence, would he/she be given favorable consideration for such a position?

Your reply will be kept in confidence. If you believe that another person can better comply with this request, we would welcome your suggestions about who we should contact.

The University of Georgia will use your reply only in the promotion process. However, these letters may be subject to release under Georgia law.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
