

**Minutes from Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
March 8, 2021**

Attendees

Members of the FAC

Wayde Brown
Shira Chess
Janette Hill
Mark Huber
Elizabeth St. Pierre
Esra Santesso
Lindsey Harding
Mark Huber
David Okech
Andrew Park
John Peroni
Annette Poulsen
Esra Santesso
Yoo-Kyoung Seock
Amanda Smith
Sarah Sumners
Elizabeth St. Pierre
Thiab Taha
Richard Vining
Brock Woodson
Jason Zastre

Guests

Elizabeth Weeks, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Barbara Biesecker, Professor, former chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee

Chair Janette Hill called the meeting to order at 9:35.

A motion was made by Elizabeth St. Pierre to approve the minutes from the January 25, seconded by Andrew Park. The minutes were approved with no changes with no dissents or abstentions.

Chair Janette Hill asked all of the committee members to review the request from the COVID-19 Response Committee for input on issues and suggestions for the CRC to share with President Morehead and the chairs of the Preventative Measures Advisory Board and the Medical Oversight Task Force. Contact information was provided.

The main focus of the meeting was to update the FAC on the status of the revised Lecturer Guidelines and to determine the next steps to be undertaken. Guests Associate Provost Elizabeth Weeks and Professor Barb Biesecker (as former chair of the FAC) have been involved extensively in the development and were invited to contribute to the discussion.

Chair Janette Hill shared that the Executive Committee of University Council had sent the Guidelines back to the FAC for further development. Commentators on the Guidelines include the Executive Committee, faculty, department heads, associate deans, etc. Chair Janette Hill summarized some of the specific areas and invited the committee to discuss these.

Before beginning discussion of areas to address, several others offered input. Elizabeth Weeks agreed with the list presented and noted that it covered many areas. She also said that there is a strong interest on campus in recognizing this rank and providing a more robust promotion track. However, the proposed guidelines are a very significant change from the current guidelines. When these do take effect, we don't want to run into unexpected problems. Thus, we all want to make sure that the work is significant but also correct. The Guidelines have been in development since 2016. All of the feedback has been in the spirit of making this a workable document.

Barb Biesecker worked on the guidelines for 3 years when she was on the FAC and came at it from the point of view of a department head in a department heavily dependent on lecturers. She noted an additional comment about the document. Provost Hu cautioned that the third tier of lecturer may not be feasible in the current UGA framework. Before proceeding, we should be sure that the third tier is consistent with UGA and USG policies. We need to get the bottom line from administrators on this before devoting too much time to developing the third tier procedures.

Barb Biesecker said that her understanding from the provost is not that there is opposition to the third track, but there may be logistical and financial roadblocks to getting there. Thus, we need to work with the administration to get this done. Dean Dorsey had noted that at the University of Florida (his former institution), when they added a lecturer rank, they did it as a phased approach based on seniority at the university. Thus, the processing and financial resources were phased in.

Chair Janette Hill had provided a list of concerns to be discussed. In turn:

20% Limit in number of lecturers

Does this need to be added to the document. Associate Provost Weeks noted that the 20% limit is set by USG but UGA has adapted the policy to put the 20% limit at the level of each School or College. There is a question of how to integrate this into the Lecturer Guidelines.

Voting rights

Who would be best to evaluate teachers? Other teachers? Perhaps not clinical faculty, for example. Elizabeth Weeks noted that the particulars of voting rights wasn't discussed at EC. The discussion focused on the importance of figuring it out. There is a range of opinions on who should vote. This is related to the issue of whether parallelism is important across the guidelines for lecturers vs. tenure track faculty. In addition, the heterogeneity of the non-tenure tracks creates many issues. Should it be determined by the individual sectors? Public service, for example, may not have the same perspective as other units. Who would vote on librarian track? There is a mix of opinions on this.

Elizabeth Weeks also said that parallelism across tenure track/lecturer track is not necessarily an important goal of the Provost's office. We all contribute in different ways. The lecturer document has been scant for years. This is an attempt to solve the problem of the lack of guidance. Marisa Pagnattaro in the Provost's Office has been enthusiastic about the development of these documents.

Terminal year

The question was raised whether the idea of a terminal year in the 6th year was consistent with employment rights and USG policy. There is concern about the “up or out” for lecturer ranks. While several people were opposed to the “out” part, it was noted that the provision was included to set standards for lecturers.

Graduate faculty status

The document needs to clarify the role of non-tenure track faculty as graduate faculty. We need to coordinate with the Graduate School to better understand this situation. Chair Janette Hill has a meeting with Dean Walcott later this week.

Third-year review

The question from EC is whether this is needed if individuals are on a yearly contract. Two perspectives were presented. First, yes, the third year review provides a bigger picture about how the individual is doing and whether they are making progress towards promotion. A yearly merit review may be more focused on the individual activities in a given year. Also, a third-year review would encompass the views of more than the department head. Thus, may provide additional important information. On the other side, it was discussed that the relevant information would indeed be included in the yearly review. Some units now include the yearly reviews in the dossier for promotion rather than a third-year review.

Teaching responsibilities

The question was asked by EC on how the criterion of “selection for teaching special courses and programs (p.8)” is consistent with the idea that lecturers often have to cover very specific courses as outlined in their terms of employment. Barbara Biesecker noted that it’s useful to think of the lecturer track as the university’s teaching track. The allocation of effort is 100% teaching and generally requires 4 classes taught each semester. Often, the lecturers are hired under special provost initiatives – individuals may be hired to handle large number of students in bottleneck courses. We talk about mimicking tenure track but it’s not the same. Lecturers teach. The lines are NOT the same.

Barbara Biesecker said that the original document was developed to give the department head the opportunity to reward someone who taught 8 classes a year when these are heavily practice oriented, with a lot of assessment activities. Wanted a document to reward these people for excellent work in accordance with their budgeted effort. Their budgeted effort is 100% teaching. Barbara Biesecker also noted that she objected robustly to the “up and out” clause in the document. If lecturers do a good job, why would you have to fire them? She noted that an earlier version of the Guidelines had erased all mention of research and was not sure it belonged in this document. We should form a document that enables and rewards the position for which we are hiring.

Research and service expectations

Mark Huber said that some individuals are allocated solely to teaching. But the document should also give a department multiple paths to choose allocation of effort – if in a department they count research or service, that should be permitted also. The document was meant to allow that flexibility. The

department should determine the allocation of effort. The document was supposed to give flexibility, not mandate one specific mode.

A couple of other questions were raised about whether a tenure track faculty member could be 100% teaching. Also whether lectures could move to tenure track positions (and vice versa).

There was a general discussion about the difficulty of applying standards across very different expectations about contributions to teaching (and research or service). The issue was raised about who is best able to evaluate an individual with a specific task – for example, an academic professional whose 100% responsibility to coach the debate team – no teaching in the classroom, no research. Trying to force parity across all does not recognize the contributions of a unique individual. Can a librarian assess the qualifications of a third-year teacher? Similarly, can a teacher assess a librarian?

Page limits

There is currently no stated limit on pages in the dossier – there should be.

Promotion committee chair

How would the chair be selected? The proposal states that the chair is “elected” rather than appointed by the dean, for example. This is different from what happens with other promotion committees.

Promotion review process/Appeals

The EC questioned whether the appeal process was consistent with tenure track process. Also, asked for better definition of the process.

Unit definition of privileges (including Appendix A)

Some believe that the definition of privileges defined by the unit are limited by proposal. Appendix A is too prescriptive and too restrictive. Didn't seem a useful or workable document.

Chair Janette Hill noted several areas for follow-up:

- Make sure we have clarification of 20% limit on lecturers at the college level vs. university level
- The addition of Principal Lecturer rank
- Voting rights clarification
- Graduate faculty status clarification

The FAC then turned to discussion on how to best proceed on rewriting the document. After extensive discussion, parameters were agreed on which would ensure that the full FAC is involved in the redrafting, as requested by the EC.

A consensus developed around meeting weekly as a full committee to discuss a specific part of the document. After FAC agreement on what to include in that portion of the document, the writing will be finalized and voted on by the full committee, either at that meeting or at the following meeting (or by electronic vote if necessary). Esra Santesso made a motion to approve this process, Annette Poulsen seconded and it was approved by the FAC with no dissents or abstentions.

A working group was formed to work on the writing of the document along the lines suggested by the FAC. The working group will be headed by Chair Janette Hill and includes Lindsey Harding, Mark Huber, Annette Poulsen, and Elizabeth St. Pierre.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:00 am.

Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Lecturers

1. Background & Definitions

1.1 Definition of Lecturer

The Lecturer faculty track includes the ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer. These are non-tenure-track, primarily instructional positions and are part of the University of Georgia's Corps of Instruction.

The primary responsibility of the Lecturer track is classroom instruction, and the appointment typically carries a 18-24 credit hour per academic year course load.

1.2 Roles of Lecturers

Lecturers' primary responsibility is instruction and, therefore, the overwhelming majority of Lecturers will spend most, if not all, of their time teaching. Hence, Lecturers are not expected to have research or administrative responsibilities. The appointment and promotion of Lecturers at the University of Georgia are based upon this norm. Any exception to this norm (such as academic advising, curriculum or course development, academic program oversight) must be detailed in the letter of hire or reappointment.

2. Requirements for Ranks

To be eligible for a Lecturer appointment at any rank, a person must have an appropriate terminal degree in a discipline related to the position's responsibilities, or, in rare circumstances, be approved by the Provost's Office, on the basis of the individual's overall qualifications, for a terminal degree exception before the position is offered.

Lecturer

This is an entry-level faculty position. Individuals eligible for appointment to this rank should possess clear potential for delivering quality instruction.

Senior Lecturer

Candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must have six years of experience at the Lecturer level (or equivalent), either at UGA or another institution. Evidence of excellence in instruction, including evidence of student learning or positive student outcomes, must be demonstrated.

Principal Lecturer

Candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must have six years of experience at the Senior Lecturer level (or equivalent). Evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices, or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings, such as dissemination of instructional innovation or participation in special teaching activities must be demonstrated.

Commented [JRH1]: Substantially updated document
Add Principal Lecturer rank to the lecturer guidelines (USG approved in 2018)
Overall updates to provide more detail and align with other guidelines (e.g., Academic Professional)

Suggested change
Throughout the document, teaching excellence is used instead of effectiveness. **Teaching effectiveness is defined but teaching excellence is not.** Could we replace "excellence" with effectiveness throughout? DeLTA chose the word effectiveness to convey
DeLTA project at UGA
<https://seercenter.uga.edu/research/current-projects/delta-project/>

Commented [JRH2]: Need to add 20% limit in terms of percentage of lecturers re: ceiling on appointments
Ceiling on Appointments
The combined number of lecturers and senior lecturers appointed at the University of Georgia cannot exceed 20 percent (20%) of all full-time lecturers, senior lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, as calculated each October by the Office of Institutional Research. This ceiling also applies to individual colleges and schools. Colleges or schools that exceed the 20 percent ceiling at the time of adoption of this policy may retain the number of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers already employed but will be expected to reduce the number of appointments to the ceiling as vacancies take place.

Commented [JRH3]: This section expands the current General Criteria (section A) to include more details of the primary responsibility and roles of lecturers.

Commented [JRH4]: This section expands the current Lecturer Ranks (section B) to include more details of each rank of lecturer. It also includes the addition of "Principal Lecturer."

Commented [JRH5]: The addition of a new rank for lecturers (approved by USG in 2018)

3. Appointment/Promotion Unit (PU) and Eligible Voting Faculty

Lecturers may be appointed in a variety of academic units, including but not limited to departments, schools, colleges, or institutes. If the unit in which the position is located 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 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 eligible voting faculty and the heads of all units involved should provide input into the search, appointment or promotion processes. In such cases, one unit should be chosen as the administrative unit for the purposes of coordinating hiring paperwork, evaluations and promotion reviews.

Commented [JRH6]: This section expands the current Appointment of Lecturers (section C) to include more details regarding voting faculty for appointment and promotion.

Ranks of Eligible Voting Faculty

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

Commented [JRH7]: Many questions/comments here – good to be inclusive but who should be included for voting (e.g., assistant professors after 3rd year review voting on lecturers to senior lecturers, Associate Professors voting on senior lecturers to lecturers)

I. APPOINTMENT

The following are eligible to vote on the appointment of Lecturers: Assistant Professor; Associate Professor; Professor; Academic Professional, Associate; Academic Professional; Senior Academic Professional; Clinical Assistant Professor; Clinical Associate Professor; Clinical Professor; Lecturer; Senior Lecturer; Principal 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.

II. PROMOTION

The following are eligible to vote on the promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers: Assistant Professors who have successfully completed their third-year review, Associate Professor, Professor, Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Associate Research Scientist, Senior Research Scientist, Librarian III, Librarian IV, Public Service Associate, Senior Public Service Associate.

The following are eligible to vote on the promotion of Senior Lecturers to Principal Lecturers: Associate Professor, Professor, Senior Academic Professional, Clinical Professor, Principal Lecturer, Senior Research Scientist, Librarian IV, Senior Public Service Associate.

All eligible faculty are expected to participate in the appointment and promotion evaluation process and to vote, except those who are required to recuse themselves.

Commented [JRH8]: This section expands the current Appointment and Reappointment of Lecturers (sections C and D) to include more details regarding the search procedures, offer letter, unit privileges, and reappointment.

4. Appointment Procedures

The procedures to appoint a faculty member to the Lecturer track should follow the regular faculty appointment policies and procedures as managed by the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA).

Generally, initial appointment within the Lecturer faculty track is recommended at the level of Lecturer rather than Senior or Principal Lecturer. Prior to an individual's initial appointment, a maximum of three years of credit towards promotion may be awarded for related service at other institutions, or service in a faculty rank within UGA. Credit towards promotion must be approved by the Provost before it is offered to a Lecturer candidate. Requests for such credit should be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs in accordance with Policy 1.09-1 Letter of Offer.

4.1 Search Procedures

To conduct a search for a position in the Lecturer faculty track, the appointment unit head should refer to and follow the stated procedures in the Academic Affairs Policy Manual, 1.08 Recruitment of Faculty.

Faculty members eligible to vote in the appointment unit (see Section 3) shall vote by secret ballot to recommend candidates for full-time appointments in the unit. This vote will be reported to the faculty of the appointment unit, as well as to the department head or dean.

The dean (or their designee) will review the vote of the appointment unit and any recommendations developed by the search committee and forward their recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the President for final approval.

4.2 Offer Letter: Duties & Expectations

A Lecturer track offer letter should follow the template provided by the OFA and will include a description of the position's duties and the Unit Definition of Privileges (see 4.3).

The specific tasks assigned to a member of this career track may vary across disciplinary boundaries and academic units, as well as across time, but the primary responsibility of all Lecturer ranks will be instruction, either in a classroom, online, or at an off-campus site. At appointment, the offer letter will specify the individual's teaching and other responsibilities, if any, the number of credit hours to be taught each year, and their allocation of effort. In addition, the letter should explain their discipline-specific expectations for promotion, if any. This offer letter will provide the definition against which each Lecturer will be subsequently evaluated, annually and for promotion, and should be created in accordance with section 5.1. If the individual's allocation of effort, assigned duties or performance expectations are changed after execution of the offer letter, these revisions must be recorded in a written addendum shared with the faculty member before their next contract period.

For Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers employed at the time of this policy implementation, the promotion unit must formulate an explicit written statement of responsibilities and performance expectations in consultation with each individual. This statement must be in place prior to the next annual review cycle.

4.3 Unit Definition of Privileges

All Lecturer positions are expected to convey privileges on par with those afforded to 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 faculty within this career track, a Unit Definition of Privileges must be generated to define these privileges and should be included in the offer letter.

Units with Lecturers or Senior Lecturers at the time of this policy revision must formulate a *Unit Definition of Privileges* in consultation with the current Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the unit, and it should be in place prior to the next annual review cycle. A template document for each Lecturer's Unit Definition of Privileges can be found in Appendix A, and unit heads may adopt or edit as necessary.

4.4 Annual Reappointment

Reappointment of full-time Lecturers employed on contract is made annually. Notice of non-reappointment must be made in a timely manner consistent with Board of Regents and university policy.

Any changes to a Lecturer's allocation of effort, specific duties, or performance expectations must be documented by the unit head before the next reappointment period, shared with the Lecturer, and filed with the original offer letter.

In accordance with Board of Regents' policy 8.3.4.3, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, or Principal Lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time continuous service in those positions at UGA and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision by a Vice Provost of Academic Affairs.

4.5 Reappointment After Six Years of Service

Faculty holding the rank of Lecturer are expected to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer in the fall of their sixth year in rank. If a Lecturer is not approved for promotion by the end of the sixth year, they may be reappointed for a seventh, terminal year in rank. During their seventh year in rank, they will be issued a nonrenewal letter in accordance with USG's and UGA's policies on notice of employment.

Commented [JRH9]: Comments/questions here – required vs. suggested; typically found in letter of offer – links into Appendix A

Commented [JRH10]: Confirm in alignment with USG policy – have been in conversations with Elizabeth Weeks, Associate Professor of Faculty Affairs

Reappointment of a Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the individual has demonstrated excellent teaching ability and the institution determines that there is a continued need for the individual.

If a Unit Head desires to reappoint at their current rank a Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service, unit specific documentation of the individual's teaching ability and the institution's need for the position will be presented to the Unit Head and members of the faculty for review.

If a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Principal Lecturer is forwarded to the Office of Vice President for Instruction and Provost in a Senior Lecturer's sixth year, the promotion process will replace this reappointment process. If the Principal Lecturer promotion application is not successful and if the unit supported the promotion application, the candidate may be reappointed as a Senior Lecturer.

The responsibility for providing evidence of instructional excellence resides with the Unit Head. Acceptable documentation goes beyond superior end-of-the-term student evaluations. Refer to Section 5.3 for a description of instructional excellence. It is required that the documentation be presented as a teaching portfolio (see Appendix B).

5. Evaluations

Performance reviews are intended to help identify opportunities that will enable Lecturers to reach their full potential in terms of contribution to the university and unit.

Commented [JRH11]: This is a new section added for evaluation of lecturers.

5.1 Annual Evaluations

An annual written evaluation of each member of the Lecturer track is required (University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, 4.7; UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual, 1.06). The criteria for evaluation will be the responsibilities and expectations specified in the Offer Letter for that particular individual, and will be limited to their assigned allocation of effort (see Section 4.2) with an awareness that the activities and the evaluation of Lecturers may differ in substantive ways from that of tenure-track or other faculty. Consideration should be given to the nature of the teaching duties, including class size (e.g., large vs. small), scope of responsibility, diversity of classes taught, etc. Feedback should be provided to the Lecturer on work performance and on progress toward promotion. Immediate supervisors are encouraged to solicit and utilize input and data from all relevant sources for evaluation and review of performance.

5.2 Third Year Performance Reviews

In addition to annual performance evaluations, Lecturers should receive a Third Year Review intended to provide a longer-term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. Third Year reviews shall be conducted by a Third-Year Review Committee that shall consist of a minimum of three faculty members of equal or higher rank, whose members are familiar with the unique roles and responsibilities of Lecturers. Reasonable effort should be made to include at least one Lecturer at the same or higher rank and may include faculty from other units contingent upon their willingness and availability to serve.

For each third-year review, the candidate will submit a dossier to their Promotion Unit Head, including a statement of “Major Accomplishments” (two-page maximum), a statement of teaching philosophy (two page maximum), a CV, and evidence of teaching excellence (five page maximum). The candidate’s Unit Head will supply to the Chair of the Third-Year Review Committee the list of responsibilities and expectations as specified in the Offer Letter and any addendums to the Offer Letter covering the period under consideration (reflecting allocation of effort) and the materials submitted by the candidate. Further evidence may be requested by the committee.

The third-year review committee will report its findings to the Unit, and the eligible faculty, including the Unit Head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and reappointment is sufficient. A quorum (at least two thirds of the eligible faculty, including non-tenure track faculty, as listed in Section 3) should be present for this vote. The Unit head is not obligated to reveal their vote. The committee will then report its recommendation, along with the vote to the Unit Head. The Unit Head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding their progress toward promotion and/or reappointment. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The Unit Head’s letter, and any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or reappointment dossier when it is developed.

5.3 Evaluation Criteria

The following factors help establish criteria in evaluating the performance of the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer where appropriate, and according to that faculty member’s responsibilities and expectations as stated in the Offer Letter and any addendum(s). Each unit may develop its own supplemental unit-specific promotion criteria for Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, or Principal Lecturers that must be approved by the promotion unit’s faculty, the Dean, and the Provost, added as a signed addendum to the offer letter, and such criteria must be in place before the next evaluation cycle occurs.

Contributions related to service, research, and administrative responsibilities are expected only for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Principal Lecturers whose Offer Letters (or whose addendums to their Offer Letter) reflect such responsibilities

and expectations in their allocation of effort. Promotion Unit Heads should indicate if the above activities were expected of the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Principal Lecturer as part of their annual evaluations.

The Standard

Teaching helps students develop knowledge, skills, and abilities within their chosen discipline and dispositions to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarly knowledge and their teaching expertise. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising or mentoring students. Use of the term "effective" and "effectiveness" throughout the document refers to the need to provide data that have been systematically collected and analyzed to support claims about teaching quality and teaching improvement. The term "systematic" means that evidence of contributions to teaching has been gathered, reviewed, and presented in an organized and methodical way that aims to reduce potential bias, allow for coherent evaluation, and promote continuous teaching improvement.

Documentation

Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and development and in improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, any combination of items from the numbered categories (#1-9) listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer, a candidate must show evidence of student learning or positive student outcomes (#1 below) and further evidence of excellence of instruction from one of the numbered categories (#2-#9).

For promotion to Principal Lecturer, a candidate must show evidence of student learning or positive student outcomes (#1 below) and evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings by completing at least three items from the numbered categories (#2-#9 below).

1. Effectiveness shown by multiple forms of evidence, including some combination of the following:
 - a. A list of courses and information from student end-of-course surveys designed to reflect teaching effectiveness and creativity, rather than popularity. In such cases, information for all courses taught in the previous three years that have been evaluated should be included unless a candidate seeks early promotion, in which case information for two years is sufficient. The candidate should report appropriate quantitative data (i.e., range, mode) for items that provide summary evaluations of the course and instructor, if collected by the department or unit.

Commented [JRH12]: See Paula Lemons suggested changes... would also impact section 6.2

Commented [JRH13]: Could we rephrase to: ... a candidate must show evidence of teaching effectiveness from category #1 and at least one additional form of evidence of effectiveness from one of the numbered categories #2-#9.

Commented [JRH14]: Could we rephrase to: ... a candidate must show evidence of teaching effectiveness from category #1 and at least three additional forms of evidence from the numbered categories #2-#9.

- b. Indicators of ongoing efforts to make teaching decisions based on evidence and to improve teaching and instruction, such as reflection on course evaluation results, observations of the candidate's instruction, and examples of student work.
 - c. Program surveys of alumni attesting to the candidate's instructional contributions to alumni preparation for further education and careers.
 - d. Letters of support from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional performance both within the traditional classroom setting and beyond it.
 - e. Performance of students on uniform examinations, in standardized courses, or from assessment data collected as part of program outcomes assessment.
 - f. Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including examples of student work or information to show the students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
 - g. Effective direction of graduate study including theses and dissertations. Documentation should include patterns of student progress toward degree, retention of students in programs and research group, or student scholarship or creative works.
 - h. Evidence of successful direction of individual students in independent studies, special student projects, or student seminars.
2. Effectiveness shown by peer evaluation of expertise in instruction, including one of the following:
- a. Systematic professional observations of instruction
 - b. Selection for teaching special courses and programs.
 - c. Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, or international study and development projects.
 - d. Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams or special commissions.
 - e. Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.
3. Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students.
4. Development or significant revision of programs and courses, including any of the following:
- a. Preparation of effective teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study.
 - b. Reflection over time on positive and negative comments from

student end- of-course evaluations and on course assessment data. Reflection should summarize actions taken to maintain or build on positive course elements and to modify problematic elements.

- c. Collaborative work on courses, programs, and curricula within the University or across institutions.
5. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
6. Scholarly activities related to teaching, including any of the following:
 - a. Textbooks, curriculum materials, published lecture notes, abstracts, or peer-reviewed articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and teaching scholarship.
 - b. Adoption of a candidate's instructional materials such as textbooks and online materials, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.
 - c. Presentation of papers on teaching before professional societies.
 - d. Presentation of papers on teaching before practitioner organizations.
7. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative and evidence-based educational activities or to fund stipends for students.
8. Departmental or institutional governance or academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching.
9. Sustained participation in teaching professional development that aligns with the candidate's efforts to improve their teaching, and demonstration of how participation has impacted the candidate's teaching practice.

6. Promotion Procedures

Timely promotion consideration is encouraged to recognize and reward accomplishments, to develop productive Lecturers, and to promote career advancement for the benefit of the individual and unit. Preparation of the promotion dossier is the responsibility of the candidate with the assistance of their unit head. Additional guidance is available from the Office of Faculty Affairs.

6.1 Promotion Timeframe

Lecturer ranks constitute a career ladder, and minimum times in rank are generally required for consideration for promotion (see Section 2); however, early promotion is not routine. Faculty who are performing significantly above the expectation for their current rank may be considered for early promotion to Senior Lecturer during their fourth year in rank, provided that strong justification is presented in the dossier cover letter.

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 in a Lecturer rank should be promoted to Senior Lecturer in the sixth

Commented [JRH15]: This section expands the current Promotion of Lecturers (section E) to include more details.

Commented [JRH16]: 4th year or 3rd year?

year of employment as a Lecturer. In the event of an unsuccessful promotion case, if a unit head desires to reappoint a Lecturer beyond the sixth year for one terminal year, a dossier containing appropriate documentation of that Lecturer's satisfactory teaching ability and value must be presented to the Office of the Vice President for Instruction and Provost in the fall of the candidate's sixth year after it is reviewed and endorsed by the appropriate Dean. The date for submission of the reappointment dossier will be set annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs. If a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is forwarded to the Office of Vice President for Instruction and Provost in a Lecturer's sixth year, the promotion process will replace this reappointment process. (*See Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion of Lecturers*).

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 early spring semester to be determined annually and provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs. This normally dictates that the promotion process begins at the unit level at the beginning of the promotion-consideration year (typically August).

Commented [JRH17]: Up or out? When should letter go out?
What happens to part-time lecturers? 12 year cycle if 50%?

6.2 Guidelines for Promotion

6.2.1 Minimum expectations for promotion of a Lecturer to the position of Senior Lecturer are evidence of student learning or positive student outcomes and further evidence of excellence of instruction, as specified through consistent demonstration of criteria listed in section 5.3.

6.2.2 Minimum expectations for promotion of a Senior Lecturer to the position of Principal Lecturer include the above expectations as well as evidence of creating and/or adopting effective instructional practices or a positive instructional impact beyond instructional settings, as specified through consistent demonstration of criteria listed in section 5.3.

Promotions for all Lecturer ranks follow the procedure as described below and thus careful consideration should be given to ensure that the unit head and review committee members fully understand the responsibilities, guidelines, and processes appropriate for each rank.

6.3 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. Under normal circumstances, in the spring of the candidate's fifth year in rank, the PU Head should notify the candidate that they are eligible for preliminary consideration that semester. If the candidate was awarded credit toward promotion at the time of hire, or if they wanted to be considered for early promotion, preliminary consideration could occur in an

earlier year. The purpose of preliminary consideration is to organize the candidate's dossier and to provide an assessment of progress toward promotion.

The candidate will submit a dossier containing a current curriculum vita, a statement of "Major Accomplishments" not more than five pages), a teaching philosophy statement (two-page-maximum), and evidence of teaching excellence (see list in 5.3). The PU Head will add a copy of the Offer Letter covering the period under consideration (reflecting allocation of effort) and any offer letter addendums to the dossier. The PU may request additional information from the candidate.

In the spring semester, the unit head will convene a quorum (at least two-thirds) of 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 their 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, their application for promotion at this point in time.

6.4 Documentation and Dossier

The key steps in preparation for evaluation are the responsibilities of the PU head and the candidate. First, a dossier must be prepared for evaluation by the appropriate PU head and candidate. The faculty member must have reasonable access to departmental facilities and services to prepare the dossier.

Preparation and verification of the contents of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the PU head and the candidate, with the candidate having the final say about the dossier's contents. Appendix B describes the elements required for the dossier. NOTE: For purposes of the PU's evaluation, only Sections 3-6 of the dossier need to be included.

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

- Offer Letter and Addendum(s) related to responsibilities and expectations.
The letter of offer and any addendums that detail the candidate's current position, responsibilities and expectations must be included. Changes or significant shifts in allocation of effort, responsibilities, and/or expectations during the period covered should be identified. If the promotion includes a change in professional responsibilities, the proposed new responsibilities and

expectations must be specified and included.

- Curriculum Vitae. No one format is necessarily prescribed as appropriate for the curriculum vitae; however, it should include the standard education and work history of the candidate and should include professional contributions or other recognitions. The curriculum vitae should also indicate the candidate's time in rank, allocation of effort, and expected responsibilities as indicated in the Offer Letter and/or addendums throughout the period under review, and clearly demonstrate relevant assignments including administration, instruction, service, and other responsibilities for which time was allocated. An example of a CV format is found in Appendix C.
- Teaching Portfolio. The candidate should document evidence of appropriate teaching accomplishments (see Section 5.3) in a teaching portfolio and explain how the requirements for the requested rank have been met (see Section 2). The teaching portfolio should be no longer than 25 pages.

6.5 Promotion Unit Evaluation

Normally, the promotion dossier will be subject to three levels of review: the first review takes place within the PU, when it renders its recommendation concerning promotion. Following this review by the PU, the dossier will be reviewed at the school/college level (see Section 6.7), and then by the Office of the Vice President for Instruction and Provost (see Section 6.8). This three-level review process will take place in those schools and colleges with departments. However, in schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, there will generally be two levels of review: the first is at the school level and the second is by the Office of the Vice President for Instruction and Provost. In these units, the school/college serves as the PU. All reviews must be conducted in a rigorous and equitable manner and must be free of political influence.

Voting Procedures for PU: All eligible voting faculty are expected to participate in the PU evaluation process by voting yes or no. Faculty from the candidate's PU will refrain from participating in any form of evaluation at all higher levels of review.

Quorum - Consists of at least two-thirds of those faculty members eligible to vote on a given candidate. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.

Abstentions - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.

Recusal - Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier.

Absentee Ballots - Absentee ballots are allowed but do not count toward the quorum. They must be cast in writing so long as they are received by the PU head before the meeting begins. Absentee ballots received after the meeting begins will

be disregarded. Absentee ballots with no vote or not clearly marked are not eligible and will be discarded.

Recommendations - Determined based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty. A tie is interpreted as a negative vote.

The PU head convenes the eligible voting faculty (p. 2) to conduct the PU evaluation.

Eligible faculty within the PU will vote by secret ballot, except for the PU head. The total number of yes and no votes must be recorded. More yes than no votes must be recorded in order for the recommendation to be recorded as positive. The PU head's vote must be revealed at the time the votes are counted. All absentee and regular ballots must be counted by two faculty members, with the results presented to the faculty before adjournment. The candidate must be informed of the results of the vote, including the tally, within three working days of the meeting.

Consistent with the principle of flow, all promotion dossiers move to the next level of review, regardless of the vote, unless the candidate indicates he/she does not wish to be considered further.

It is the responsibility of the PU head to prepare Sections 1 (UGA Promotion Recommendation Form), 2 (Cover Letter), and 6 (Offer Letter and Third Year Review) of the dossier. If the PU head voted against the promotion, then the candidate may designate a senior faculty member from the PU to substitute for the PU head. This person prepares Section 2; the PU Head still prepares Sections 1 and 6. Before a dossier goes forward, the candidate should review Sections 1 through 5 for accuracy. Since Section 1 reports results and Section 2 represents a synthesis of faculty judgment, the candidate may correct only manifest errors in reported facts.

Unless the PU head voted against the candidate, the dossier goes forward with a cover letter from the PU head (or their designee). In the event that the PU vote was negative, the PU head, regardless of their vote, will summarize the deliberation for the PU's negative vote as a separate document in the dossier. The candidate will have five working days to read and respond in writing to any cover letter and/or rationale before it goes forward. The candidate must have access to this information, which includes the vote of the eligible PU faculty. Whether or not the PU head prepares the cover letter, he/she (or designee) is responsible for

preparing a summary of the procedural steps followed by the PU in reaching its vote, including relevant dates where appropriate. This statement is to be forwarded with the dossier.

No revision/alteration of existing documents in the dossier are allowed after the PU vote has been taken. Any factual errors must be corrected via cover letter or candidate's response as the dossier moves forward to the next level of review. The candidate may add evidence of an award or other significant achievement to the dossier at any time during the review process. This documentation should be accompanied by a letter of request to add to the dossier and will be included in the cover letter section.

6.6 School/College Review

Schools/Colleges without Departments:

In those schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the first level of review takes place within the school/college, which serves as the PU and follows all procedures for the PU review as outlined in the previous section. This review takes place in accordance with the school/college's written criteria for promotion, and in a manner that is consistent with these *Guidelines*. In these units, the dean will not serve as the PU head. The school/college should establish written procedures for the selection of the PU head.

Schools/Colleges with Departments:

In those schools or colleges with departments, the first level of review takes place in the PU in accordance with its criteria for promotion. Upon completion of that first-level review, the PU will transmit the candidate's dossier to the school/college review committee(s) in accordance with the procedures outlined above. At that time, the candidate, PU head or Senior faculty member designated by the candidate may supplement the record with claims regarding procedural error, if necessary. In all cases, at the school/college committee review, the committee will review the case to ensure that no procedural error exists. The committee also will ensure that the candidate meets the criteria specified in these *Guidelines*, as well as criteria specified by the PU.

- a. *Deference to Initial Determination.* The burden of evaluating the qualifications and suitability of the candidate for promotion is greatest at the first level of review. Significant weight will be given at the higher levels of review to the judgments and recommendations of lower-level review committees (particularly at the PU level).
- b. *Appointment and Composition of the School/College Committees.* The Dean appoints the members of the school/college review committee(s); these *Guidelines* recommend that such committees consist of at least five eligible

faculty members of the school/college and must include representation at the Senior or Principal Lecturer rank as appropriate. The chair is elected from among the Senior or Principal Lecturers in the school/college.

c. Voting Procedures for Schools/Colleges with Departments.

- *Quorum* - Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.
- *Abstentions* - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.
- *Recusal* - Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier. No committee member may vote twice on a candidate's application for promotion and must therefore be recused from voting on any candidate from the member's own PU.
- *Absentee Ballots* - No absentee ballots are allowed.
- *Recommendations* - The PU's recommendation may be reversed only if a 2/3 majority of the eligible committee members who are present at the meeting vote to reverse the outcome at the lower level. Refer to the next section regarding cases where a school/college review committee concludes that a procedural error exists that has not been properly evaluated or remedied at the PU level.
- *Voting* - Voting will be conducted by secret ballot with two designated faculty members assigned to count the ballots.

d. *Additional Procedures for School/College Review Committees.* Where a School/College Review Committee concludes that procedural error(s) exist that have not been properly evaluated or remedied at the lower level of review, the School/College Review Committee may take one of the following actions:

Remand the case to the PU if such error can be corrected within the current promotion cycle, with instructions concerning how to proceed thereafter.

- (1) Find that the procedural error was fatal to the candidate's ability to achieve a fair evaluation of the record at the PU level or a record worthy of promotion. A finding of such fatal procedural error by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible school/college review committee members will nullify a negative PU vote. The committee will then vote, based on all available information, including knowledge that a fatal procedural error occurred, on the candidate's application for promotion. The resulting recommendation of the school/college review committee, based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty, will be

forwarded to the Vice President for Instruction and Provost in place of the nullified PU vote. A tie vote is interpreted as a negative vote.

- (2) With the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible.
 - (3) Determine that any procedural error was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate's application for promotion, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate's application.
- e. Regardless of the outcome of the school/college committee vote (favorable or unfavorable) the dossier will be forwarded for a review by the Vice President for Instruction and Provost. In addition, the committee must record the rationale for its decision to affirm or reverse the lower-level decision. This rationale must be in writing and must be transmitted, along with the tally of the vote, to the candidate, who will have the opportunity to respond to the committee's rationale within five working days. The rationale of the school/college vote and any such response of the candidate will be included in the dossier for consideration by the Vice President for Instruction.
- f. *Role of the Dean.* All promotion decisions (including both positive and negative decisions) must be sent to the dean of the school/college for review. The dean (or their designee) will provide a thorough, independent evaluation of each candidate for promotion. By this means, the dean will achieve several important objectives of the promotion. These include: (1) ensuring consistency in the application of the standards for promotion within the school/college; (2) promoting fairness in the promotion process; and (3) seeing to it that candidates for promotion are central to the mission of the unit and school/college.

The dean (or their designee) will be ex-officio, non-voting member of the school/college review committee(s). After the vote has been taken at the school/college level, the dean (or their designee) will write a letter evaluating the candidate, introducing the dossier as it goes forward to the Office of Faculty Affairs for transmission to the VPI. The letter will include the vote of the appropriate faculty of the PU, as well as the vote of the school/college review committee. The candidate will have five working days to read and respond in writing to the dean's letter before the dossier moves forward to the VPI. To that end, the candidate must be given timely access to the dean's letter. The candidate's response will be included in the dossier as it moves forward.

6.7 Vice President for Instruction and Provost Reviews

All dossiers will be forwarded with the Dean's recommendation to Office of Faculty Affairs by the fall deadline published for that year. The Vice President for Instruction will review the dossier (and may employ an appointed advisory committee in the process) and forward it to the Provost with her/his recommendation. The Provost's recommendation shall be transmitted to the President for final consideration. Negative decisions may be appealed as detailed below (Section 7).

7. Principle of Flow and Appeals

Lecturers or Senior Lecturers 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 appropriate Vice President or Dean to which their unit reports. This is consistent with the Principle of Flow as defined in the UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure for Academic Rank Faculty.

Negative recommendations for promotion at the Vice President or Provost level may be appealed. Appeal requests should be submitted in writing by the candidate to the next level of review, with an informational copy to the appropriate Dean, within seven days after notification by letter of the negative recommendation. The candidate'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.

For promotion to Senior or Principal Lecturer, the appeal will be submitted to a separate committee appointed by the Provost or President and composed of faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate (see Section 3, Ranks of Eligible Voting Faculty), who will then make a reappraisal of the candidate's record. The committee's recommendation will be submitted to the responsible administrator at the appeal level. If the appeal is at the Provost's level, the Provost will forward his/her final recommendation to the President after the appeal committee completes its review. If it is at the President's level, the President will consider the appeal committee's recommendation before making a final decision.

Commented [JRH18]: This is a new section to provide more details for the current section, Appeal Process.

Appendix A. Unit Definition of Privileges Template

Name of Unit/Department:

Name of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Member:

Faculty Rank: Lecturer (or Senior or Principal Lecturer)

Effective Date of this Definition of Privileges:

This position includes the following faculty privileges and expectations:

- Attendance and full participation at faculty meetings and retreats of the Department/Unit, and School/College
- Voting rights identical to those of tenure-track faculty members for all Departmental/Unit affairs, with the exception of voting on appointment, promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty
- Ability to serve on departmental, School/College, and University Council faculty governance committees, as allowed by bylaws
- Ability to submit grants as a Principal Investigator with an anticipated change to their allocation of effort (if appropriate) in consultation with their Promotion Unit Head
- Ability to apply for awards, professional development opportunities, and training offered by the University, School/College, and/or Department/Unit as appropriate
- Ability to apply for Graduate Faculty status and to serve on graduate student committees
- Access to professional development/travel funding following the same procedures as for other faculty in the Department/Unit
- Listing on Department/Unit website as “faculty”
- Allocation of office space and access to Departmental/Unit administrative support personnel and resources following the same procedures as for other faculty in the Department/Unit
- Annual reviews and consideration for Departmental/Unit-level merit raises based on the position’s duties and expectations
- All other faculty benefits specified for the role by the University System of Georgia, the University of Georgia (including by the Office of Faculty Affairs and the University Council), and the School/College

Commented [JRH19]: Clarification from the Graduate School: cannot hold Graduate Faculty Status can serve on committees under certain circumstances

Appendix B. Dossier for Promotion of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

The purpose of this dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. The candidate for promotion should document their most important achievements in a teaching portfolio (see Section 5 below). The contents and organization of the dossier are described below.

Section 1: Recommendation for Promotion Form

Use the Recommendation for Promotion Form for the Lecturer Track (See Appendix D).

Section 2: Unit Head 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. The letter should also include the unit head's recommendation to support or not support the promotion application.

- A. *Background.* List the candidate's position and key professional accomplishments. Use the offer letter and any addendums to guide the emphasis on particular areas.
- B. *Summary of the Candidate's Achievements.* Summarize the candidate's professional accomplishments and the quality of these contributions to the unit and/or university as they relate to the requirements for the requested rank (p. 1) and the candidate's teaching effectiveness (p. 6). Anchor these comments with references to the pages of the dossier where the evidence is presented.
- C. *Assessment of the Candidate's Stature.* Evaluate the candidate's stature within the unit and/or school/college. Again, anchor these comments with references to the pages in the dossier where the evidence is presented.
- D. *Need for Services.* Demonstrate a continuing and long-range need for the candidate. Show how the duties assigned to the candidate are essential to the unit fulfilling its mission at present and in the future.

Section 3: Unit Criteria

In some cases, academic units may elect to supplement this document with unit criteria. If so, then these criteria should be considered in promotion decisions.

Section 4: Curriculum Vitae and Candidate's Statement (five-page max) of "Major Accomplishments."

The curriculum vitae should include the standard education and work history of the candidate and should include professional contributions, awards, grants, and/or other recognitions. The curriculum vitae should also indicate the candidate's time in rank, allocation of effort, and expected responsibilities as indicated in the Offer Letter and/or addendums throughout the period under review, and clearly demonstrate relevant assignments including administration, instruction, service, and other responsibilities for which time was allocated. See Appendix C for a suggested format for the CV.

Section 5: Teaching Portfolio

The Teaching Portfolio should document the candidate's achievements since appointment or promotion to present rank in relation to the Offer Letter and any addendums. Evidence should

include relevant examples, such as those listed in Section 5.3 that reflect teaching effectiveness. Below is a framework for the Teaching Portfolio and a listing of elements that should be included in it. Section 5 of the dossier should be no more than 25 pages.

- Statement of Teaching Philosophy (two-page max)
- Evidence of Teaching Excellence (see section 5.3)
- Service to the University, the Profession or Society (if applicable)
- Research, Scholarship or Other Creative Activities (if applicable)

Section 6: Offer Letter and Third-Year Review

The Teaching Portfolio should include the Offer Letter that indicates allocation of effort throughout the period under review and clearly demonstrates relevant instructional assignments and other responsibilities for which time was allocated. Changes or significant shifts in allocation of effort, roles, and/or responsibilities during the period covered should be identified. If the promotion includes a change in professional responsibilities, the proposed new responsibilities and expectations should be included. The candidate's promotion unit Third Year review final report should be included.

Appendix C. Recommended Vita Format

In an effort to produce a more uniform reporting procedure, the following outline is recommended for the vita in promotion dossiers.

1) Academic History

1. Name
2. Present rank: Recommended rank:
3. Allocation of effort (% time) assignments
4. Administrative title (if any)
5. Graduate Faculty status
6. Highest degree, the institution, the date
7. List of academic positions in chronological order with titles and inclusive dates
8. Other professional employment (current and previous), dates
9. Post-graduate awards (fellowships, lectureships, etc.)

Commented [JRH20]: Needs to be removed – cannot hold Graduate Faculty Status

2) Instruction

1. Courses Taught, including title, enrollments, and credit hours
2. Development of new courses
3. Supervision of Graduate Student Teaching or Research, including degree objective, graduation date, current placement of student
4. Graduate Student Advisory Committee Membership
5. Supervision of Undergraduate Research, including thesis status, period of supervision, current placement of student
6. Internship supervision
7. Instructional Grants Received (dates, dollar amounts [total & amount to the candidate], investigator status)
8. Recognitions and Outstanding Achievements (teaching awards, prizes, fellowships, awards won by your students etc.)
9. Academic Advising
10. Professional development

3) Scholarly Activities/Creative Work (as applicable)

If joint endeavors are listed on the CV, faculty should briefly describe how authorship order is assigned in their discipline. Scholarly outputs appropriate to the discipline and as specified by the PTU criteria, should be listed. Peer-reviewed and invited items should be identified as such with asterisks or other markers as defined in the CV by the candidate.

1. Publications (Indicate number of pages for books or chapters).
 - (a) Books authored or co-authored (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions
 - (b) Books edited and co-edited (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions
 - (c) Chapters in books (in print or accepted)
 - (d) Monographs (longer than articles, in print or accepted)
 - (e) Journal articles (in print or accepted)

- (f) Bulletins or reports (in print or accepted)
 - (g) Abstracts (in print or accepted)
 - (h) Book reviews (in print or accepted)
 - (i) Patents
 - (j) Works submitted but not yet accepted
 - (k) Any other (e.g., popular articles)
 - (l) Creative contributions other than formal publications
2. Grants received (dates, amounts [total & amount to the candidate], principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or co-investigator status)
 3. Recognitions and outstanding achievements (teaching awards, prizes, fellowships, etc.)
 4. Supervision of student research (including number of theses and dissertations supervised)
 5. Convention papers/Proceedings
 6. Presentations
 - a. Invited seminars/lectures
 - b. Conference talks
 - c. Poster presentations
- 4) Public service (as applicable)
1. Extension,
 2. International programs,
 3. Local community services and relations, and
 4. To governmental and nongovernmental agencies
- 5) Professional service (as applicable)
1. Service to professional societies, governmental organizations or nongovernmental agencies
 2. Editorships or editorial board memberships for journals or other learned publications
 3. Ad hoc manuscript reviewer
 4. Grant review panel member
 5. Ad hoc grant reviewer
 6. External evaluator of promotion/tenure dossier
 7. Service on departmental, college, or University committees
 8. Special administrative assignments
 9. Service to student groups and organizations
 10. Service to support units such as libraries, computing services and health services

Appendix D – Recommendation for Promotion Form for Lecturer Track.

Promotion and/or Reappointment of Lecturers¹, Senior Lecturers, and

Principal Lecturers Dossier Checklist

Name _____ Current Rank _____

Department _____ School/College _____

Recommendation For: (check one) _____ Promotion and Reappointment
 _____ Reappointment Only (SL & PL)
 _____ Do Not Reappoint

Promotion to: (check one) _____ Senior Lecturer _____ Principal Lecturer

Contract Type: (check one) Fiscal Academic Adjunct (not paid)

Items in Dossier (Ensure all items are included in the electronic dossier (pdf format) at each level of review)	<input type="checkbox"/> or N/A
Table of Contents	
Section 1: UGA Recommendation for Promotion Form	
UGA Recommendation for Reappointment Form	
Section 2: Unit Head Cover Letter(s) for Promotion	
Dean's Cover Letter(s) (not a part unit level dossier)	
School/College Review Committee Written Rationale and Vote (not a part unit level dossier)	
Candidate's Letter(s) of Response (as applicable)	
Section 3: Unit Criteria (as applicable)	

Section 4: Curriculum Vita	
Candidate's Statement of "Major Accomplishments" (five-page maximum)	
Section 5: The Teaching Portfolio Statement of Teaching Philosophy (two-page maximum) Evidence of Teaching Excellence (25-page maximum) Service to the University, the Profession or Society (if applicable) Research, Scholarship or Other Creative Activities (if applicable)	
Section 6: Letter of Offer (<i>include statement of any approved changes in assignment</i>)	
Third--Year Review (<i>for Lecturers only</i>)	
Optional Section 7*: Brief Statement of Qualifications of Each External or Internal Evaluator	
Identification of Evaluation Letters from Candidate's List vs PU's List	
Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation (<i>optional</i>)	

NOTE: Do not submit appendices for university level review.

*As applicable, external and internal review requirements specified by unit criteria.