Faculty Affairs Committee meeting
September 21, 2020

Chair Janette Hill called the meeting to order at 1:05 PM.

Committee members present (18 of 24): Shira Chess, Nancy Dellaria, Puneet Dwivedi, Lindsey Harding, Janette Hill, Mark Huber, John Peroni, Amber Prentiss, Esra Santesso, Yoo-Kyoung Seock, Amanda Smith, Elizabeth St. Pierre, Sarah Sumners, Thiab Taha, Richard Vining, Elizabeth Weeks, Brock Woodson, Jason Zastre

1. Old Business
   a. Discussed invitation for FAC member to participate in Franklin Senate committee exploring similar issues as FAC. More information will be coming after Franklin Senate meeting in October.
   b. Guidelines for Promotion and Promotion of Lecturers
       i. Update on progress of revisions provided by Mark Huber; additional updates to follow at future FAC meetings.
   c. Approved minutes of April 13, 2020, FAC meeting.
   d. Academic Professionals Appointment and Promotion Guidelines
       i. Distribution of draft language to update guidelines regarding faculty ranks eligible to vote on retention and promotion of academic professionals.
       ii. Discussion of inviting Dr. Paul Matthews, Associate Director of the UGA Office of Service-Learning, to a future meeting to discuss reasoning for potential revisions to guidelines.
       iii. Request to circulate process document drafted by Lindsey Harding and Academic Professional document drafted by Esra Santesso.
       iv. FAC will revisit issue in future meetings.
   e. FAC Resolutions Regarding Covid-19 and Faculty Review
       i. Distribution of draft amendments to Resolution 1 passed in prior special meeting.
       ii. Amendments adopted by majority vote of FAC.
       iii. Discussion of resolution distribution to (1) UGA president's office and (2) University Council as information item and new business.
       iv. Simultaneous distribution to UGA president's office and University Council approved by majority vote.
2. No New Business.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:15 PM.

Resolution 1: FAC Resolution Regarding Faculty Governance

Given that the duty of the UGA University Council Faculty Affairs Committee is "To review and recommend policies on matters of faculty concern related to faculty productivity and evaluation, including but not limited to activities and programs, appointment, promotion and tenure, post tenure review and academic freedom," the Faculty Affairs Committee demands that faculty governance plays a greater role in choices made by university administration, and that faculty input is sought in decision-making processes about policies and procedures related to the COVID-19 pandemic and other circumstances at the University that pertain to our charge. To this end, the FAC requests that the Faculty Conference be convened to "provide a forum to discuss issues of concern to the faculty" as stated in Part IV of the University Council Bylaws.

Specifically, the FAC requests the following measures:

1. That faculty be able to postpone promotion and/or tenure or post-tenure reviews by delaying reviews for at least for one full academic year which could be extended due to disruptions and hardships caused by COVID-19 (inclusive of productivity, increased teaching demands, illnesses, and childcare demands).

2. That the evaluation of faculty teaching and outreach performance, research, service, and productivity by students and/or other stakeholder groups be viewed in light of disruptions and hardships caused by COVID-19. Specifically, we request that faculty are given the option to write a contextualizing letter that addresses pedagogical and other appropriate strategies or additional activities, and that the letter is weighted in equal parts to the evaluations themselves.

3. That the UGA administration continues to support academic freedom in all forms related to teaching, research, service, and outreach, including instructional content, pedagogical delivery, and classroom management. As defined in the University Statutes, Article X, Section 5, academic freedom is defined as: "University Faculty members are entitled to full freedom of expression in research, teaching, and publishing, subject only to those restrictions that are imposed by professional ethics and respect for the rights of others. University Faculty members have the right to criticize and seek alteration of both academic and non-academic University policies, whether or not those policies affect them directly. University Faculty are free from institutional censorship, discipline, or reprisal affecting their professional careers for exercising freedom of expression."

Resolution 2: FAC Resolution Regarding Surveillance

The University of Georgia is notable for the experience and expertise of its instructional faculty. We pride ourselves on making students our top priority. The FAC asks for transparency and consistency across units regarding teaching responsibilities and practices. In particular, the committee is concerned with recent reports of faculty surveillance and auditing of classroom activities. We firmly believe that faculty governance directly corresponds with our ability to have teaching autonomy in the subjects in which we are experts. In this unprecedented time, faculty should be permitted to change their instructional plans to be flexible throughout the course of the semester as long as academic and pedagogical integrity is maintained.

Deleted: should be included in

Deleted:

Commented [ES1]: Here is the exact language in the bylaws: "The Faculty Conference shall provide a forum for the discussion of issues of concern to the faculty. It is composed of all University Council faculty members who are elected and those who are appointed by the Executive Committee. It shall elect a chair and a secretary. Meetings shall be called by the chair or upon petition of ten members of the Conference. Based upon its deliberations, the Conference may refer items or suitable actions to the Executive Committee or other committees of the Council."

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: To that end,

Deleted: <#>That faculty governance plays a greater role in choices made by university administration; to this end we request that FAC be invited to participate in the administration's discussions about policies and procedures that directly affect all lines of faculty at the university. ¶

Deleted: <#> t

Deleted: <#>stopping the clock

Deleted: <#>That all promotion, tenure, and annual reviews (of all faculty ranks and classes) be conducted in consideration of the many disruptions and hardships caused by COVID-19, inclusive of productivity, increased teaching demands, illnesses, and childcare demands. ¶

University of Georgia Guidelines for the Appointment and Promotion of Academic Professionals

Approved by University Council April 2018

1 Background & Definitions

1.1 Definition of Academic Professionals

The academic professional[1] faculty track includes the ranks of *Academic Professional Associate*, *Academic Professional*, and *Senior Academic Professional*. These are non-tenure-track faculty positions and are part of the University of Georgia's Corps of Instruction.

The role of an academic professional at any rank includes a wide range of academic assignments that call for academic backgrounds similar to that of a faculty member with professorial rank but with differing professional responsibilities, including training and instructional support, technical assistance, and/or specialized management. Occupants of these positions have obtained an appropriate terminal degree. The academic professional designation may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the assignment. Academic professionals are not eligible for consideration for the award of tenure, or for probationary credit toward tenure.

These guidelines apply equally to part-time and full- time academic professionals of any rank.

(Sources: Academic Affairs Policy Manual, 1.01; 1.02; Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.1; 8.3.8.3)

1.2 Roles of Academic Professionals

Faculty in the academic professional track engage in a range of specialized duties which may include managerial, administrative, research, technical, public service, instructional support, and/or instructional responsibilities (see Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.8.3). They may be employed in academic departments, centers/institutes, and/or campus-wide offices. They engage in scholarly and professional work appropriate to their field of specialization, to their job duties (see Section 4.3), and to the mission(s) of their particular unit. Examples include administering academic programs/units/initiatives, managing instructional laboratories, operating instructional technology support programs, academic advising, counseling professional students, providing specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs, working with other faculty in course and curriculum development and in the laboratory, conducting research, providing technical assistance, and teaching or providing instructional support. Academic professionals may apply for Graduate Faculty status.

See Appendix C for further examples of activities appropriate for academic professional positions. Each academic professional position has specific roles and responsibilities reflected in its corresponding allocation of effort, which may be distributed among Research, Instruction, Service, and Administration. For these faculty, the allocation of their time to research and instruction combined must sum to less than 50%. The positions are not standardized over the entire university, as the requirements for each position depend on the needs of the hiring unit. Reviews of performance and evaluation for promotion must be based on the specific assignment of duties and allocation of effort (see Section 4.3).

2 Requirements for Ranks

To be eligible for an academic professional appointment at any rank, a person must have a terminal

---

[1] Note: In this document, when lower-case, "academic professional" refers to this faculty track regardless of rank, while specific ranks are referenced through use of capitalization/italics (e.g., "*Academic Professional Associate*.")

degree in a disciplinary area appropriate for the position (as defined in the job posting), or in rare and extraordinary circumstances and with approval of the university president or his/her delegate, qualification on the basis of demonstrably successful related experience and clear potential for high quality performance in their assigned responsibilities.

Appointment to and promotion within the academic professional ranks includes consideration of years in professional service, levels of experience and accomplishment, evidence of peer recognition, and impact within one's areas of responsibility. Generally, initial appointment to the academic professional faculty track is recommended at the level of *Academic Professional Associate*, which is the entry-level rank. Prior service at other colleges/universities or in other related professional activities may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirement for years in rank but is not automatically applicable. Promotion credit for previous academic or professional experience must be explicitly awarded, with approval from the President or his/her delegate, prior to the time of employment.

2.1 Academic Professional Ranks

Academic professional faculty ranks constitute a career ladder analogous to, but distinct from, that of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. There is no maximum time limit for service in any academic professional rank.

The **Academic Professional Associate** position is an entry-level faculty position. No minimum number of years in a lower rank is required. Candidates for appointment to this rank should show evidence of a high level of competence in the disciplinary area of the position, and demonstrated promise of moving towards excellence in professional leadership, practice, service, instruction, and/or scholarly activities as appropriate for the position.

The **Academic Professional** position is the second of three progressive ranks in this faculty track. Under normal circumstances, candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must have had five (5) years of experience at the *Academic Professional Associate* level (or equivalent) either at UGA or another institution. Candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must show evidence of a high level of achievement and impact as appropriate for the position's duties, as well as recognition of professional excellence by peers outside the hiring unit. Individuals at this rank must present evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities within the scope of their assigned duties.

The **Senior Academic Professional** position is the third of three progressive ranks in this faculty track. Initial appointment to this rank can occur in exceptional circumstances. An individual would normally be eligible for appointment or promotion to this rank after at least five (5) years of experience at the *Academic Professional* level (or equivalent). Candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must show evidence of a high level of achievement and impact as appropriate for the position's duties, as well as recognition of professional excellence by peers external to the university. Individuals at this rank must present evidence of established stature as national or international authorities within the scope of their assigned duties.

3   Appointment/Promotion Unit and Eligible Voting Faculty

Academic professionals may be hired by a variety of units, including academic departments, interdisciplinary institutes, university-wide centers, offices reporting to a Dean, Vice President or Provost, etc. Under usual circumstances, the eligible voting faculty in an academic professional's **appointment** unit (department, school, college, center, institute, office, etc.) will consist of the full-time tenure-track, tenured and non-tenure-track faculty in the unit. Faculty eligible to vote on academic professional promotions must hold a rank equal to or superior to the recommended rank (see Section 3.1 for a

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: and promotion

Commented [SFC1]: When I went to enter FAC's "motion 3" from the 3/2/20 meeting, I discovered that with slight modification, this sentence was nearly identical to the language in the motion. Hence, I institution the revisions at this position in the document.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: at the position's rank or above

complete listing). If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (fewer than five), then the unit head should identify faculty (primarily academic professionals at or above the rank being considered for the candidate) from related units who are willing to serve as members of an ad hoc academic professional appointment or promotion unit. 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/promotion unit faculty, and the heads of all units involved should provide input into the search, appointment, and promotion processes. In such cases, one unit should be chosen as the administrative home for the purposes of coordinating evaluations and promotion reviews. If the unit head himself/herself is under consideration for promotion as an academic professional of any rank, the Vice President or Dean he/she reports to, or their delegate, should manage the promotion process instead of the unit head.

3.1 Ranks of Eligible Voting Faculty

The ranks of eligible voting faculty in the unit for appointment/promotion voting are as follows:

The following are at or above the rank of *Academic Professional Associate*: Assistant Professor; Associate Professor; Professor; Academic Professional Associate; Academic Professional; Senior Academic Professional; Clinical Assistant Professor; Clinical Associate Professor; Clinical Professor; Lecturer; Senior Lecturer; Assistant Research Scientist; Associate Research Scientist; Senior Research Scientist; Librarian I; Librarian II; Librarian III; Librarian IV; Public Service Assistant; Public Service Associate; Senior Public Service Associate.

The following are at or above the rank of *Academic Professional*: Associate Professor; Professor; Academic Professional; Senior Academic Professional; Clinical Associate Professor; Clinical Professor; Senior Lecturer; Associate Research Scientist; Senior Research Scientist; Librarian III; Librarian IV; Public Service Associate; Senior Public Service Associate.

The following are at or above the rank of *Senior Academic Professional*: Professor; Senior Academic Professional; Clinical Professor; Senior Lecturer; Senior Research Scientist; Librarian IV; Senior Public Service Associate.

4 Appointment Procedures

The procedures to appoint an academic professional 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 exception:

The *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* for the position and the *Unit Definition of Privileges* (see below) must be in the offer letter, or provided as an attachment, in addition to the standard information required in the Office of Faculty Affairs' faculty offer letter template.

4.1 Search Procedures

To conduct a search for an academic professional, the appointment unit head should refer to and follow the stated procedures in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual, *1.08 Recruitment of Faculty*. Appointment unit faculty members eligible to vote (Section 3) shall vote by secret ballot to recommend candidates for academic professional track appointments in the unit. The unit head will report the vote to the faculty of the unit as well as to the Dean/Vice President the unit reports to. This Dean/Vice President will review the vote and any recommendations developed by the search committee, and forward his/her recommendation to the Provost for final approval.

> **Commented [SFC2]:** Note: these lists will need revision whenever rank names are revised at UGA.

4.2 Unit Definition of Privileges

Academic professional positions are expected to convey privileges on par with those afforded tenure-track faculty and in line with university and school/college policies. However, the specific privileges may vary with rank and appointment unit; thus, for each unit hiring academic professionals, a *Unit Definition of Privileges* must be generated to define these privileges. The *Unit Definition of Privileges* should include, but is not necessarily limited to, such things as expectations for attendance at faculty meetings and voting rights with respect to unit/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.

The *Unit Definition of Privileges* should be consistent for all faculty of a given rank in the same unit. Units with academic professionals of any rank at the time of this policy revision should formulate a *Unit Definition of Privileges* for and in consultation with these current academic professionals in the unit. The *Unit Definition of Privileges* must be in place prior to the next promotion cycle and be revised in a timely manner.

4.3 Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations/Allocation of Effort

The specific tasks assigned to academic professional positions may vary by position, disciplinary boundaries and academic units, as well as across time and rank. Therefore, it is not appropriate to apply the same performance criteria for the evaluation of all academic professionals, nor to apply criteria used for other faculty tracks to the work of academic professionals. Consequently, a position-specific *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*, including explicit expectations for allocation of effort and standards for achievement, will be generated for each academic professional position. This Statement will provide the standards against which each academic professional is evaluated annually, and subsequently for promotion, and should be created with this in mind. All *Statements of Responsibilities and Expectations* must be consistent with the university's rank requirements (see Section 2.1) and should be revised following promotion to set new, elevated standards for performance. The *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* will be made available to and discussed with candidates during the hiring process, and will be included with the offer letter.

For existing academic professionals of any rank at the time of this policy revision, the promotion unit should formulate an explicit *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* in consultation with these faculty members. This Statement must be in place prior to the next promotion cycle for a particular position and revised in a timely manner when roles and responsibilities change.

4.4 Reappointment

Reappointment of academic professionals is made annually. Notice of non-reappointment must be made in a timely manner consistent with Board of Regents and university policy.

5   Annual Evaluations

A written annual evaluation of each academic professional is required (University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, 4.7; UGA Academic Affairs Policy 1.06). The criteria for evaluation should be based on the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* for that particular academic professional position, based on the specified proportions of administrative, research, teaching, and service responsibilities (see Appendix C). Any changes to the academic professional's effort distribution or job description must be documented in a revised *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* that is shared with the faculty member. Immediate supervisors are encouraged to solicit and utilize input and data from all relevant sources for evaluation and review of academic professionals.

6   Promotion Procedures

Timely promotion consideration is encouraged both to recognize and reward accomplishments, to develop productive academic professionals and their units, and to promote career advancement for the benefit of the individual and unit. Preparation of the promotion dossier is the responsibility of the candidate in consultation with his/her supervisor.

6.1 Promotion Timeframe

Academic professional ranks constitute a career ladder, and minimum times in rank are generally required for consideration for promotion (see Section 2.1). However, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for "early" promotion during their fourth (4th) year in rank, provided that strong justification is presented in the dossier cover letter.

Promotion is not routine; each rank has its own performance criteria. Thus, successful performance at one rank in and of itself does not necessarily imply having met the criteria for the next rank simply with the passage of time. Individuals within an academic professional rank are not bound by mandatory promotion within a set time frame. That is, there is no maximum number of years permissible at any given rank for academic professionals.

Generally, in a given year, promotion-related activities should occur within a time frame appropriate for dossiers to be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the annual fall deadline. The length of the entire promotion review cycle is similar to that of academic rank faculty. For example, if the promotion process begins with preliminary consideration in the spring of the faculty member's fourth (4th) year in rank, and the request is ultimately approved by the President, the promotion will take effect at the start of the sixth (6th) year of service. Should the candidate fail to meet the deadlines established by the unit for submission of the required documentation, consideration of promotion may be delayed until the following year. See Appendix D for more on the promotion timeframe and approval workflow. Once the promotion review process has been initiated, the candidate can request that the promotion review process be discontinued at any point.

6.2 Guidelines for Promotion

Each candidate for promotion will be evaluated on the basis of the quality of performance of assigned responsibilities stated in his/her *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* and on whether or not she/he meets the university criteria for the rank (see Sections 2.1 and 4.3).

Promotions for academic professionals are not identical to those for other faculty tracks and thus careful consideration should be given to ensure that the unit head, reviewers, and review committees fully understand these guidelines, and expectations for academic professionals.

6.3 Promotion and Compensation Considerations

In the absence of central funding for academic professional raises upon promotion, each Dean or Vice President should establish consistent raise levels for all academic professionals within their units. Salary increases upon promotion comparable to salary increases for tenure-track faculty are expected, dependent upon the availability of funds. Salary increases upon promotion should be distinct from merit raises.

6.4 Preliminary Consideration

Preliminary consideration is a required step towards promotion, although the outcome of the preliminary consideration is advisory to the candidate, rather than binding. The candidate must request preliminary consideration during the spring semester preceding the fall semester during which he/she expects

promotion will be formally considered. The purpose of preliminary consideration is to organize the candidate's dossier and to provide an initial assessment of progress toward promotion.

The candidate will submit a current curriculum vitae, *Statement(s) of Responsibilities and Expectations* covering the period under consideration, a candidate statement (no more than five-page) highlighting accomplishments related to his/her roles and responsibilities, and up to five (5) examples of relevant, best work. (See Appendix A for details about these documents.)

In the spring semester, the unit head will convene the eligible voting faculty of the appointment/promotion unit (see Section 3) to indicate if they think the candidate warrants further consideration for promotion. After reviewing and discussing the preliminary dossier, the eligible faculty will vote by secret ballot. Within three (3) days of the vote, the unit head or his/her designee must notify the candidate in writing of the eligible faculty's recommendation. The unit head may also provide feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the dossier as perceived by the voting faculty. The candidate may decide to proceed with, or defer, his/her application for promotion at this point in time.

6.5 Peer Review

Evaluation of promotion dossiers by peer reviewers is carried out to provide insight on the quality, impact and recognition of the candidate's achievements.

Subsequent to the preliminary consideration (see Section 6.4), if the candidate chooses to proceed, the unit head will solicit from the candidate the names of three to five (3-5) prospective peer reviewers who are in a position to appropriately evaluate the dossier for promotion. Depending on the rank that is sought and the candidate's responsibilities, these evaluators may be internal to the university or external. If external, they may be local, regional, national or international authorities in their field. If internal, they must not be in the candidate's appointment/promotion unit. At least two (2) of the evaluators for a *Senior Academic Professional* candidate must be external to the university and able to evaluate the candidate's national/international stature. The candidate may also construct a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as evaluators. The unit head will also identify three to five (3-5) additional reviewers, in consultation with other unit faculty (non-tenure-track and tenure-track) as appropriate.

The unit head will contact a subset of the proposed reviewers, and will not contact anyone the candidate has declared a non-assessor. Normally, up to six (6) reviewers will be contacted, with representative balance between the candidate and unit nominations. In order to ensure balance between candidate- and unit-selected reviewers, reviewer declinations and non-responses may entail solicitation of additional reviewers.

The candidate will prepare and submit the following promotion dossier elements to the unit head prior to the end of the spring semester to provide to reviewers (see Appendix A): the candidate's *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*; curriculum vitae; candidate statement; and exhibits. The unit head will submit these to the invited reviewers, along with a solicitation letter clearly explaining the request, timeline, and specific nature of the academic professional role at the University of Georgia. When soliciting letters from reviewers, the unit head should request that peer assessments address performance based on the quality, significance, and/or impact of the candidate's professional achievements, including as documented in the attached dossier materials, as well as the candidate's local, regional, national or international reputation and relative standing in his/her field. (See sample solicitation letter in Appendix B.) At least three (3) letters of review should be received. All letters of evaluation received must be included in the dossier.

6.6 Documentation and Dossier

In order to address performance accurately and fairly, the dossier must both explain the nature of the candidate's roles and responsibilities and document the candidate's performance related to those roles and responsibilities. The dossier components should be customized to align the candidate's roles and responsibilities with associated performance. The required dossier components are outlined in Appendix A.

6.7 Promotion Unit Evaluation

The promotion unit (see Section 3) 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.

The unit head will convene the eligible faculty and serve as chair of their deliberations. The unit head will also document votes in accordance with the promotion guidelines. The eligible voting faculty will review all dossier documentation, and request further clarification or materials from the candidate or unit head if needed. Individual faculty will cast secret ballot votes to support or not support the promotion application. Under usual circumstances, eligible faculty will vote "Yes" or "No"; they cannot vote "Abstain." Recusal is allowable only when a conflict of interest exists that would preclude that faculty member from rendering 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. At least two-thirds (2/3) of the eligible faculty must take part in the vote for a quorum to exist. The unit recommendation will be based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty members; a tie will be interpreted as a negative vote. The unit head must reveal his/her vote at the deliberation meeting. The candidate must be informed of the results of the vote within three (3) working days of the meeting.

The unit head will write a cover letter for the promotion dossier (see Appendix A, Section 2) which includes a summary of the outcome of the unit-level review, including the vote tally (Yes, No, Recuse) and a summary of the faculty's assessment of the dossier when it is compared to the *Statement of Roles and Expectations* and the university requirements for ranks. Should the unit head disagree with a positive unit faculty recommendation, he/she must appoint an alternate proponent to write the cover letter. In drafting the letter, the unit head is encouraged to solicit input from supervisors with direct knowledge of the candidate's performance and contributions.

The candidate must be given an opportunity to review the unit head cover letter (de-identified or redacted so as to protect the identity of peer reviewers or other individuals cited) for accuracy and may provide a written response within five (5) working days for inclusion in the promotion dossier.

6.8 Dean/Vice President Review

The dossier will be reviewed by the appropriate Vice President or Dean (depending on reporting structure for the unit the faculty member is based in). The Vice President/Dean may, at his/her discretion, appoint a review committee of senior faculty (including *Senior Academic Professionals*) to examine the documentation for each promotion recommendation; however, faculty members who participated in the promotion unit review are not eligible to vote again on the same dossier as part of the second-level review committee. With this proviso and subject to conflict of interest recusals, this review committee will vote by secret ballot on each recommendation. The chair of the review committee will submit a summary of the deliberations, vote, and recommendation (based on simple majority vote of the eligible review committee membership, with a tie interpreted as a negative vote) to the Dean or Vice

President, who will notify the candidate in writing of the outcome of the review. Whether or not a review committee is convened, the Dean or Vice President will provide a letter outlining his/her recommendation, to be included in the dossier. The candidate will have five (5) working days to respond to this letter.

6.9 Provost Review

All dossiers will be forwarded with the Dean's/Vice President's recommendation to the Office of Faculty Affairs for review by the Provost, and final consideration by the President. Negative decisions may be appealed as detailed below (Section 7).

All materials in the promotion dossier (see Appendix A) must be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the fall deadline published for that year. The Provost will forward his/her recommendation on the promotion request to the President.

7   Principle of Flow and Appeals

Dossiers that receive a negative promotion recommendation at the unit level will go forward with the promotion unit recommendation to the Vice President or Dean who oversees their unit, unless the candidate chooses to withdraw. This is consistent with the Principle of Flow as defined in the *UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty*.

Unsuccessful applications for promotion at the Dean/Vice President review level may be appealed. Appeal requests should be addressed to the Provost and submitted by the candidate to the Office of Faculty Affairs within seven days, after notification by letter of the Dean's/Vice President's negative recommendation. The 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 only be based 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 to the Provost may be reviewed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Provost and composed of *Senior Academic Professionals* and Professors. This committee will provide the Provost with a recommendation on the merits of the appeal, which will be communicated to the candidate, Dean/Vice President, and unit head within five (5) working days of receipt. The Provost will make his/her judgement and accordingly inform the same individuals.

Appendix A. Dossier for Promotion of Academic Professionals

The purpose of the promotion dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion, and should be prepared in a concise manner. The candidate for promotion should document his/her most important achievements and may include a maximum of five (5) exhibits with the dossier to provide detailed evidence of these achievements. The contents and organization of the dossier are described below. See supporting information and guidance on the process at the Office of Faculty Affairs website.

Section 1: Recommendation for Promotion Form
Use the *Recommendation for Promotion Form – For Academic Professional, Lecturer, Librarian, Public Service, and Research Scientist Ranks*, available on the Faculty Affairs web site (http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure).

Section 2: Cover Letters (and optional candidate responses)
The unit head cover letter should summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's promotion. Include the information specified below. This cover letter shall be the principal letter of evaluation from the promotion unit. The letter should also include the tally of the vote from the unit-level review (see Section 6.7) and indicate that a quorum was present.

> *Background*. List the candidate's position and key/significant professional accomplishments in the relevant areas of administration, instruction, research, and/or service, since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank. Use the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* to guide the emphasis on particular areas.

> *Impact of Candidate's Achievements*. Describe the quality and impact of the candidate's professional accomplishments on the unit, university, and/or profession in areas related to the position. Anchor these generalizations with references to the pages of the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented, and (where appropriate) from peer reviews, unit promotion committee discussions, and/or direct supervisor feedback.

> *Assessment of the Candidate's Stature*. Make generalizations about the candidate's local, regional, national, or international stature among those of his or her specialty and time within the discipline. Again, anchor these generalizations with references to the pages in the dossier, peer reviewer letters, and/or exhibits where the evidence is presented and to the university requirements for the recommended rank (Section 2.1).

The cover letter from the Dean/Vice President will evaluate the candidate as compared to expectations for the position and recommended rank, and if appropriate, include the vote tally and rationale of the second-level review committee (see Section 6.8).

Any candidate responses to cover letters will be included in this section of the dossier.

Section 3: Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations
The *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* that details the candidate's title, responsibilities and expectations for performance must be included (see Section 4.3). Changes or significant shifts in assigned distribution of effort or responsibilities during the period covered should be identified.

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae (20 pages maximum)
No one format is necessarily prescribed as appropriate for the curriculum vitae; however, it should include the education and work history of the candidate, and should include professional contributions,

awards, grants, or other recognitions. The curriculum vitae should also indicate the candidate's allocation of effort throughout the period under review, and document all responsibilities or projects relevant to each area of assigned work, i.e., administration, instruction, research, and/or service.

Section 5: Candidate Statement of Achievement

The statement of achievement is a narrative written by the candidate, no more than five (5) pages in length, describing and documenting his/her major accomplishments in rank with regard to administrative duties, teaching, research, and/or service, as appropriate, in relation to the criteria for promotion and the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*. Evidence of impact and stature in the profession should be included. Criteria or evidence such as provided in Appendix C may be used to help craft the candidate's case.

Section 6: Exhibits

Three to five (3-5) examples of the candidate's best work in their current rank should be included. Exhibits may include reports, published papers, books, software, art productions, or other relevant examples that document the candidate's achievements and impact. Candidates are encouraged to present exhibits electronically or online.

Section 7: Annual Evaluations

Include the annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since initial appointment or most recent promotion at the University of Georgia. These annual evaluations (Section 5.2) detail the candidate's performance during the period under review and should summarize performance based on the candidate's assigned responsibilities.

Section 8: Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations are critical to providing knowledgeable assessments of the candidate's performance. At least three (3) letters solicited from peer reviewers must be present in the dossier; all letters received must be included. It is the responsibility of the unit head to solicit letters from peer assessors who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work, following the guidelines and procedures described in Section 6.5 of the main document. (Appendix B presents a sample letter for soliciting peer review letters.) The unit head should also prepare a brief statement of the qualifications for each person evaluating the candidate as a preface to this section of the dossier.

Appendix B. Suggested Solicitation Letter for Evaluation of Academic Professional Dossiers

Dear___:

The University of Georgia is considering the promotion of Dr. X to the rank of Z.

The rank of Z is the *[select correct option for rank:]* second/third of three non-tenure track faculty ranks within the "academic professional" career track at UGA. Faculty in this career track engage in a range of specialized duties, which may include managerial, administrative, research, technical, public service, and/or instructional responsibilities, although research and teaching in combination must comprise less than 50% of the assigned work. Candidates for promotion to the Z rank are expected to present evidence of a high level of achievement and impact as appropriate for their job duties, as well as recognition of their professional excellence by peers *[include following for* Senior Academic Professional *candidates:]* external to the university. Individuals at this rank must present evidence of emerging stature as *[for* Academic Professional *candidates:]* regional or national authorities within the scope of their assigned duties *[or, include following for* Senior Academic Professional *candidates:]* established national or international authorities within the scope of their assigned duties.

Because the specific tasks assigned to each academic professional position may vary, each faculty member in this career track is provided with a position-specific *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* that explains their duties and associated performance standards.

To aid us in rendering a wise promotion recommendation for Dr. X, we seek a thoughtful evaluation of his/her achievements. You have been recommended to us as particularly able to evaluate his/her qualifications as documented in the enclosed CV, statement of achievements and supporting exhibits. For your reference, the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations* for this position is also enclosed. We would appreciate your candid opinion of the Dr. X's qualifications, and any other information you can provide that will help in making a well-informed promotion decision. We are especially interested in the following:

1. The length and nature of your relationship with the candidate.

2. The quality, significance, and/or impact of the candidate's professional achievements, as documented in the attached dossier materials, and as appropriate to his/her job duties.

3. The candidate's regional, national or international reputation and relative standing in his/her field.

Please address your evaluation letter to _____. To be included in the promotion process, the letter must be received by (date). The University of Georgia will use your reply only in the promotion process. However, it may be subject to release under Georgia law. If you believe that another person can better comply with this request, we would welcome your suggestions about whom we should contact.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

_____

Appendix C. Academic Professional Potential Scope of Activities and Evidence of Effectiveness

The narrative below is intended to provide further perspective into the types and scope of activities and potential evidence of effectiveness of the work of academic professionals. These may be used to help evaluate performance and frame or develop the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*; however, they should be interpreted to fit the circumstances of the particular faculty member, disciplines, and units. For *Senior Academic Professionals*, evidence of national/international reputation may be documented in any area of assigned work.

- **Management/Administrative/Leadership Activities**. Most academic professional positions entail management, administrative, and/or leadership elements as a key part of the position's allocation of effort. Thus, the academic professional's performance in carrying out assigned management or administrative responsibilities and the ability to organize and manage other people effectively should be considered. Depending on the position and responsibilities, such activities might include administering academic programs/units/initiatives, managing instructional laboratories, operating outreach or instructional programs, and the like. Evidence of effectiveness might therefore be based on evidence of program development, management, delivery, recruitment, and/or growth; curriculum development; grant/contract writing, budget management, and/or reporting; facility or laboratory management; fund-raising; website or social media development or maintenance; campus-community engagement; program evaluation; or other indicators as appropriate to the position and responsibilities. Additionally, evidence of accomplishment (e.g., awards) and of professional growth and development in this area (e.g., leadership programs, learning communities, certifications, etc.) may be considered.

- **Research and Creative Activities.** Academic professionals may be assigned research/scholarship duties as part of their allocation of effort (subject to the limits in Section 1 of the main document). If so, these could include applied research, scholarship of teaching and learning, scholarship of engagement, scholarship of discovery, research related to practice, program evaluation, and/or disciplinary scholarly research. Depending on the position, scholarly products might take forms such as: policy reports; curriculum; diagnostic or assessment instruments; publication of peer reviewed articles in scholarly journals; non-refereed articles and local journals; books, chapters in books, and monographs published or accepted for publication; papers or presentations at regional, national, or international meetings of professional organizations; performances, shows, or exhibitions; disciplinary collaboration with universities, institutes, community partners or industry groups outside UGA; patents; software; award of or applications for research grants or contracts; or other evidence of research or creative activities as appropriate to the discipline. If scholarship is part of the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*, the academic professional should be evaluated based on achievement and impact of their research and creative accomplishments. Additionally, evidence of accomplishment (e.g., awards, grants) and of professional growth and development in this area should be considered.

- **Teaching/Training Activities**. Academic professionals are part of the Corps of Instruction at the University of Georgia and may be assigned instructional duties as part of their allocation of effort (subject to the limits in Section 1 of the main document). This could include not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. If instruction is part of the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*, the academic professional's accomplishments in the area of teaching or training should be evaluated. The

academic professional's activity level and effectiveness as a teacher, trainer, or mentor may be considered, as indicated by (for example) student/participant evaluations; course syllabi; evidence of student learning; course handouts and outlines; or peer reviews. Other evidence of involvement and accomplishment might include: curricular innovation (e.g. developing or teaching online coursework, experiential or service-learning opportunities, etc.); advising; publication activities related to teaching and learning; and organizing or teaching workshops/training courses, on or off campus. Evidence of scholarly teaching (cf. University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, 4.7.2); participation in professional development activities related to pedagogy or teaching innovation (e.g., workshops, Fellows programs, faculty learning communities); and evidence of accomplishment (e.g., awards or teaching grants) and of professional growth and development in this area should also be considered.

- **Service Activities**. Academic professionals may be assigned service and outreach duties as part of their allocation of effort. If service is part of the *Statement of Responsibilities and Expectations*, the Academic Professional's contribution to excellence in service should be evaluated based on his/her role in the service being performed and the percentage of effort assigned. Service to society may refer to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and university missions. Service to the university may refer to activities that support, enhance, or extend the work of the department/unit, school/college, or university. Examples might include participating in departmental/unit, school/college and/or university committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a college representative on a major university committee or task force); or developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects. Service to the profession may refer to activities that support, enhance, or improve the profession, whether defined as one's discipline or as teaching. Examples might include offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; or review of grants applications. If an academic professional's role includes the operation of a service, technical assistance, or outreach facility, whether on or off campus, evidence of effectiveness might include improving unit service activities; developing and promoting new services; helping to streamline present activities; or making them more accessible to potential clients. Indication of impact might include records of how service is provided and evidence or testimony of effective service to a particular client base. Additionally, other evidence of accomplishment (e.g., awards or grants) and of professional growth and development in this area may be considered.

Appendix D: Academic Professional Promotion Timeline and Approval Workflow

The following outline provides a summary of the typical promotion timeline for academic professional-track faculty. Details of each step are explained in the main document.

Early in Spring Semester (4th year in rank or later)

- Candidate initiates process by notifying promotion unit head
- Candidate collects/generates documentation for preliminary consideration

Late in Spring Semester

- Promotion unit reviews and provides feedback on preliminary consideration
- Candidate is notified of preliminary consideration recommendation
- Candidate chooses whether to proceed or not
  - If candidate chooses not to proceed, process ends
- Candidate submits names of potential peer evaluators and non-assessors to unit head
- Promotion unit head develops list of additional potential peer evaluators
- Candidate prepares required dossier components (Appendix A)

Early Summer

- Promotion unit head selects and solicits reviews from peer evaluators, sending candidate documentation to peer reviewers with specific due date (Appendix B)

Late Summer/Early Fall Semester

- Promotion unit head makes final promotion dossier, including peer review letters, available to eligible voting faculty
- Eligible voting faculty convene to evaluate and vote on dossier
- Promotion unit head notifies candidate of vote outcome and recommendation, within 3 days

By Mid-October

- Unit head (or alternate proponent) drafts cover letter summarizing unit vote and evaluation of dossier
- Candidate reviews (blinded) letter, and if desired, responds in writing within 5 days
- Unit head completes Promotion Recommendation Form; adds it and any candidate response to dossier
- Dossier forwarded to the appropriate Dean/Vice President for evaluation
  - Dean/Vice President may convene review committee (optional); if so, chair submits letter (including vote) to the appropriate Dean/Vice President summarizing deliberation and recommendation
- Dean/Vice President writes cover letter, summarizing his/her recommendation (including information from the review committee, if convened)

- Candidate reviews (blinded) letter, and if desired, responds in writing within 5 days
- Candidate can appeal negative outcome

<u>Third week in October</u>

- Dean/Vice President adds any candidate response to dossier and submits dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs for Provost and President review

<u>Late Fall Semester</u>

- Provost forwards recommendation to President

Early in Spring Semester

- President makes final decision on promotion application and candidate is notified

Start of Next Employment Contract (in July or August)

- Promotion takes effect