

College of Education Guidelines for Promotion of Career Track Faculty

Approved May 21, 2008

St. Pierre, Oliver, Atilas, Cervero, Hoy, Matthews

Note: At the University level, the term “career track” is not widely used; however, it is used in the College of Education (COE) and, therefore, in this document. Since these guidelines, in large part, mirror the university’s Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, they should be revised as appropriate when those guidelines are revised by the COE Senate Career Track Promotion Committee with the consent of the COE Faculty Senate. The University’s Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure should be consulted and followed as appropriate for the promotion of career track faculty. If there is a discrepancy between the two documents, the University guidelines supersede the COE guidelines.

According to the College of Education’s [Faculty Senate Bylaws, Article 1](#), the Faculty of the College of Education shall consist of the Dean and the Corps of Instruction as defined in the [Board of Regents Policy Manual](#) and ex-officio members designated by the [University of Georgia Statutes](#).

Consistent with those definitions, the College of Education (COE) strives to insure that tenure track faculty (professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors) and non-tenure track or “career track” faculty (lecturers, academic professionals, public service professionals, research professionals/scientists, clinical faculty, and others) are treated equitably while recognizing their different responsibilities.

The Vice President for Public Service and Outreach is responsible for promotion guidelines for public service personnel, the Vice President for Research is responsible for promotion guidelines for research professionals/scientists, and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is responsible for guidelines for lecturers and academic professionals. This document provides additional COE-specific details and requirements for faculty beyond those guidelines.

This document and Article III, Section 7, Special Committees of the COE Faculty Senate Bylaws provide general guidelines for promotion of career track faculty in the COE not governed by the university guidelines listed in the preceding paragraph.

The College of Education maintains useful information and links related to promotion and tenure for faculty on its website at <http://www.coe.uga.edu/adfaculty/facservices/promotenure/index.html>.

PROCEDURES

I. Induction

- A. Department Heads and other departmental faculty are encouraged to mentor career track faculty as they do tenure track faculty while recognizing their differences.
- B. The unit head will give career track faculty a copy of these Guidelines and the specific written promotion criteria of the appropriate Vice President when they are hired. The unit head will meet with the new faculty member to discuss the criteria and the Guidelines. The faculty member's assigned workload must allow time for satisfying the requirements for promotion.
- C. The budget unit is responsible for all reviews (third-year, preliminary consideration, promotion) and may solicit input as appropriate from other centers, labs, and academic units.

II. Annual Evaluation

Every career track faculty member must receive a written annual evaluation conducted according to the defined criteria of the unit, consistent with Board of Regents policy. The review will include consultation by the unit head with the faculty member and preparation of a written report to the faculty member, who may respond in writing.

III. Third Year Review

Career track faculty must undergo a third year review in the spring of the third full academic year of employment using the procedures described in the next paragraph. Career track faculty who were employed in the COE prior to August 2007 but who have not had a third year review will not be expected to have a third year review document. However, the COE requires that career track faculty hired August 2007 or later have this document for their promotion dossier.

Career track faculty will prepare their dossiers detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. The unit head will appoint a faculty committee to provide a thorough review of the candidate's dossier. This committee should be composed of at least 3 faculty members and at least one of those, if possible, should be another career track faculty member, if possible, of the same type as the faculty member under review. If the faculty member under review is assigned to a department, the review committee should be from that department. For career track faculty with no departmental affiliation, the unit head will form an *ad hoc* promotion committee to conduct both a third-year review and a preliminary consideration for the candidate. The third-year review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about his/her progress toward promotion at the University of Georgia. The third-year review committee will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion is sufficient and report its vote to the unit head. The unit head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promotion. The candidate may reply in writing to the report, 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 dossier.

In any year, a department head/dean may determine not to extend a contract to a nontenured faculty member. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the head by the unit faculty, consistent with the department and the promotion unit's (PU) written criteria.

IV. Preliminary Consideration

In order to receive preliminary consideration for promotion, the candidate must request in writing to the unit head that she/he be considered. Such a request suffices to receive preliminary consideration, which typically occurs in the spring prior to the academic year in which the promotion review would occur. Each year, the unit head will convene (or contact, if the unit has faculty in various locations) the unit faculty to vote so they may consider those individuals who are being evaluated for promotion. Faculty eligible to participate in this vote are all full-time faculty (tenure track and career track) affiliated with the unit at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. Based on a current vita and other material deemed relevant by the unit, the unit's faculty will decide whether to proceed with the promotion process for those requesting preliminary consideration. The unit head is responsible for informing the candidate within 3 business days of the unit's recommendation on whether he/she will be reviewed for promotion. Preliminary consideration is not a formal part of the promotion process. Therefore, the outcome of the vote for preliminary consideration will not appear in the promotion dossier. For career track faculty with no departmental affiliation, the required preliminary consideration vote is conducted by the unit's ad hoc promotion committee that conducted the third-year review.

V. Eligibility and Timeline

Because different types of career track faculty members have different eligibility requirements, the unit head and the faculty member will review the appropriate timeline for promotion eligibility. While time in rank does not guarantee or imply promotion, it does have important implications for the appropriate timeline for starting the promotion process using these Guidelines. Following the Procedures for Promotion below, the dossier assembly, external evaluation, and unit review will begin in January. The COE Career Track Promotion Committee convenes at the beginning of Fall Semester, with recommendations forwarded to the University by mid-October. If approved, the promotion will take effect the following fiscal year. See the appropriate information at the <http://www.coe.uga.edu/adfaculty/facservices/promotenure/index.html>.

VI. Procedures for Promotion

A. Preparing for Promotion Unit Evaluation.

Two key steps in preparation for evaluation are the responsibilities of the unit head and the candidate. Dossiers for career track faculty assigned to the office of the dean of the COE will be prepared by the unit head in collaboration with the candidate and reviewed by the associate dean to whom the unit head reports.

1. *Preparation of the Dossier.* A dossier not exceeding 25 pages will be prepared for evaluation by the appropriate unit faculty. An exhibit file/box containing samples of work referred to in the major accomplishment section of the dossier should also be prepared.

Preparation and verification of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the unit head and the candidate, with the candidate having the final say about the dossier's content, except for the requirement that all external letters of review be included. The content of the dossier should include, in the following order, Regents Summary Sheet for Promotion, cover letter, vita, 2 page statement of accomplishments, letter of offer, third year review, achievement section, and external evaluations. The vita and the achievement section together should not exceed 25 pages. The faculty member must have reasonable access to departmental facilities and services to prepare the vita and to organize information.

The dossier should be presented in a professional manner avoiding an informal style and have a clearly apparent organization reflecting the responsibilities of the career track. References in the vita for refereed journal articles, conference presentations, book chapters, electronic media, reviews, and other publications and activities should follow APA 5th edition. Section headings in the vita should be clear and inclusive (i.e., contracts should be separated from grants). Information should be included in the dossier only once. The unit head and the faculty member should check the dossier to be sure that information is consistent throughout. The candidate should review the dossier to be sure that the information is accurate and includes all significant information.

Dossiers for all faculty are due in the COE Faculty Services Office on the same date, usually, early August.

Dossier for Promotion to Senior Lecturer. In addition to information described in the above section, a statement of the faculty member's philosophy of teaching should be included in the dossier (e.g., how the candidate thinks about teaching, how the candidate makes pedagogical decisions). The unit head may send some of the dossier materials to external reviewers (e.g., position description, vita, philosophy of teaching, sample syllabi). Reviewers could be asked to comment on the philosophy of teaching relative to trends in the field, quality of syllabi, teaching load, student evaluations, work with field sites or community agencies, and so forth.

2. *External Letters.* The unit head is to obtain objective and impersonal external appraisals of the quality of the candidate's contribution from persons highly qualified to provide an assessment. Preferably, five such appraisals will be obtained, but in any event, the evaluation cannot be conducted with fewer than four external appraisals, at least two of which must be from a list of potential external evaluators supplied by the candidate. Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors, co-authors, and personal friends. Because of the unique nature of these positions, it is recommended that a description of the career track the candidate is on be included in the packet of information sent to the external reviewers. Refer to the university's *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* or to the Public Service and Outreach

[Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion](#) for a sample form for requesting external letters of evaluation.

The candidate constructs a list of up to six potential external evaluators and their qualifications as reviewers. The unit head must select and include in the dossier letters of evaluation from at least two of the candidate's designated external reviewers and will inform the candidate in writing when the letters have arrived. The candidate also constructs a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external reviewers. There should be no contact at all with these individuals during the promotion review. The dossier must also include at least two letters from individuals not on the candidate's approved list. If one or two of the external evaluators cannot or do not respond, another letter may be requested, maintaining a balance of letters from the candidate's list of reviewers and from the unit head's list. All letters of evaluation must be included in the dossier.

B. Reviews

Normally, the promotion dossier will be subject to two levels of review: unit review and college review. However, dossiers for faculty assigned to the dean's office units prior to August, 2007 may not have a unit review. For those hired since August, 2007 the unit review will be conducted by the already-formed ad hoc committee for the candidate.

1. *Promotion Unit (PU) Review*

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.

- Eligible faculty: All full-time faculty members at or above the rank being sought by the candidate are eligible to vote.
- 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.
- Abstentions: No abstentions are allowed.
- 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 may 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.
- Recommendations: Determined based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty. A tie is interpreted as a negative vote.

The unit head convenes the appropriate faculty to conduct the PU review. 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

candidate to be approved. 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 unit head to prepare a cover letter for 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 head.

The unit head cover letter should clearly report the work assignment of the individual and the time in rank since career track faculty may have had various appointments and/or work assignments. The unit level vote should also be reported in the letter along with a summary of accomplishments and an assessment of the candidate's work. Before the dossier goes forward, the candidate should review the cover letter for accuracy but may correct only manifest errors in reported facts and not syntheses of faculty judgment. Before the candidate reviews the letter, however, identification of any external reviewers must be deleted.

Unless the PU head voted against the candidate, the dossier goes forward with the cover letter from the PU (or his/her designee). 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.

2. *College-Level Review.* 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.

For faculty in departments, the first level of review takes place in the department in accordance with its written criteria for promotion. Upon completion of that first-level review, the PU will transmit the candidate's dossier to the college review committee. 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 college review committee the committee will review the case to ensure that no procedural error exists. The committee will also ensure that the candidate meets the criteria specified in these Guidelines. Criteria for each type of career track faculty are specified by the University at the <http://www.coe.uga.edu/adfaculty/facservices/promotenure/index.html>.

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 this level of review to the judgments and recommendations of the PU review committee and to the principle of peer review.

- a. *Appointment and Composition of the Promotion Committee for Career Track Faculty.* The dean appoints five committee members. The COE Career Track Faculty Promotion Committee should be composed of career track faculty at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. If needed for a full committee complement, tenure track faculty at or above the rank being sought by the candidate who are knowledgeable about and familiar with the distinct roles of career track faculty may be appointed to the committee. The chair of the committee is elected at the first meeting and is a voting member. The dean or the dean's designee attends all meetings.
- b. *Voting Procedures.*
 - 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.
 - Abstentions: No abstentions are allowed.
 - 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 three (3) 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 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.
 - The results of the votes of the COE Career Track Review Committee will be forwarded to department heads at the same time as those of the COE Tenure Track Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- c. *Additional Procedures for College Review Committee.*

Where the College Review Committee concludes that procedural error(s) exist that have not been properly evaluated or remedied at the PU unit, the College Review Committee may take one of the following actions:

1. Remand the case to the PU if such an error can be corrected within the current promotion cycle, with instructions concerning how to proceed thereafter.
2. 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

vote of three (3) of the eligible 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 college review committee, based on a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty, will be forwarded to the appropriate Vice President's review committee. A tie is interpreted as a negative vote.

3. With the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible.
4. 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.

Role of the Dean.

All promotion decisions (including both positive and negative decisions) must be sent to the dean of the college for review. The dean (or the dean's 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 process. These include (1) ensuring consistency in the application of the standards for promotion within the college, (2) promoting fairness in the promotion process, and (3) seeing to it that candidates are central to the mission of the unit and college.

Final revision April 19, 2008