

*Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Policies
for the Department of Educational Psychology*

Revised April 2015
Effective September 1, 2015

Introduction

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY) will carefully adhere to The University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (see most current version: <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/promotion-tenure>). The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's guidelines. All faculty members are expected to be familiar with this Promotion Tenure Unit (PTU) document and the University Guidelines. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's Guidelines will supersede this document. It is emphasized that this document refers only to faculty on **tenure-stream trajectories**, that is, whose positions could transition from assistant, to associate, to professor level throughout the course of their career, and who might be eligible for tenure.

Voting Eligibility

The Department of Educational Psychology is the "unit" for promotion and tenure. Faculty eligible to vote on appointments, third-year reviews, promotions, and tenure are stipulated in the University Guidelines.

Department Procedures for Appointment, Third-year Review, and Promotion and Tenure

Appointment

All new Educational Psychology tenure-track faculty members will be given a **copy** of the Promotion and Tenure criteria at the time of their appointment. The faculty member shall sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of the included criteria. The Department Head, in consultation with annual faculty evaluation committees, will provide **written advice** to faculty below the rank of Professor on progress towards promotion on the annual evaluation, with specific suggestions for teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure, as appropriate.

The Department values mentoring and support of junior faculty. We believe that junior faculty represent an investment of substantial human and financial resources, and retention and promotion of contributing faculty benefits the entire department. This philosophy supports a formalized mentoring structure designed to provide as much assistance as possible toward promotion. The Department Head will assist the faculty member in choosing a **Mentoring Committee**, composed of at least three individuals, to each junior faculty member in the first year of employment. The purpose of the Mentoring Committee will be to meet at least one time each semester with the faculty member being mentored to review progress and recommend activities for progress toward promotion and tenure. The Mentoring Committee should consist of at least three people, with at least two from the Department of Educational Psychology.

During the second year, the junior faculty member can revise the mentoring committee, as she or he and the department head deem appropriate. Any mentor assignment may change upon agreement among faculty member, mentor, and Head. The mentor(s) and the Department Head will serve as a team to provide advice in professional matters, particularly preparation for promotion and tenure. A chair of the mentoring committee (generally from the candidate's area of emphasis) will be selected and facilitate called meetings.

Third Year Review (Approved by the faculty of the Department of Educational Psychology on March 21, 2014)

The third-year review, a formative process, occurs at the end of the third year of appointment for assistant professors. If an assistant professor comes to the University of Georgia with two or three years prior credit towards tenure and requests to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the third year of appointment at the University of Georgia, preliminary consideration for promotion and/or tenure will replace the third-year review. Faculty members undergoing third-year review will prepare their dossiers in collaboration with the PTU Head detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. This dossier should take the form of Sections 4 and 5 of the promotion and tenure dossier. The head of the PTU will appoint a faculty committee, in accordance with the appointment unit bylaws, to provide a thorough review of the individual's dossier. This committee will contain no fewer than three eligible faculty members. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure at the University of Georgia. The third-year review committee will report its findings to the PTU, and the eligible faculty, including the PTU Head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. The committee will then report its recommendations, along with the vote, to the PTU head. The PTU head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU head/s letter, and any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.

Preliminary Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

The Department of Educational Psychology will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the University Guidelines. Although it is preferred that a faculty member submit a written request to the Department Head for promotion and/or tenure considerations in their fourth year of rank, an assistant professor may also choose to be considered for promotion and tenure by the 1st of September during their 5th year of rank. Associate professors pursuing promotion to professor may request consideration when he or she has determined professional readiness. A faculty member who is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure also should work closely with her or his Mentoring Committee and the Department Head in preparing the dossier.

Annual Review

Educational Psychology evaluates its faculty annually in the areas of **Teaching and Mentorship, Research, and Service**. The following criteria are applied in each area: Fails to Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations. Several examples are provided in each of the areas in the Peer Assessment Rubric (see departmental example in the departmental procedures handbook; these are examples only and are not meant to represent every

product or activity that may result in a particular rating. In addition, the faculty will also consider level and position in their evaluation (expectations vary for assistant, associate, and professors). In particular, assistant professors should not be overly committed to activities that hamper their progress in establishing a research program – this principle may be applied in evaluation of their student committee and service work and course preparation.

Each faculty member must submit a brief personal statement to assist the committee in their evaluation. The relative importance of various service activities, grants, and different forms of publication varies within each discipline in our department. Faculty members should specify their budgeted time for each area of the annual evaluation rubric. In addition, neither the Faculty Activity Report nor the faculty member's curriculum vitae fully documents the depth of work with advisees. Faculty members are requested to provide a description of work with students in such detail that the review committee can ascertain the contributions the faculty member has made to the individual student's development. The personal statement also allows for further explanation of any variance from a typical profile. Failure to submit information about anomalies in the year or failure to include information about budgeted time, limits the faculty evaluation committee's work and could result in that committee's inability to give a fully-informed and accurate evaluation. The personal statement is necessary for making reasonable and fair assessments of annual performance. In addition, faculty should submit a copy of the UGA Faculty Activity Report and a copy of the Curriculum Vitae.

Coupled with the completion of the evaluation of Teaching and Mentorship, Research, and Service, the committee will also make a determination whether the faculty profile for that year is commensurate with minimal requirements for budgeted time. In those cases where the committee notes that an individual **Fails to Meet Expectations** in an area of their annual review, the executive committee will be convened to evaluate the allocation of the individual's budgeted time. Evidence from the committee should be provided that cites a rationale for the Fails to Meet Expectations rating. The committee will consider the most recent 3 years of annual reviews, current curriculum vitae, and the personal statement in their evaluation. In light of this information, the committee may decide the budgeted allocation is appropriate, despite the rating of Fails to Meet Expectations, or may recommend to reallocate an individual faculty member's time. Each faculty member's assigned time is reviewed, and adjusted as appropriate, annually within the department.

Formal Review for Promotion and/or Tenure

The Department of Educational Psychology will follow procedures for formal review presented in the University Guidelines.

Department Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Educational Psychology and must be reviewed and approved by the Dean of the College of Education and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and the University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, Dean of the College of Education, and Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the

PTU document. This iteration of the document was approved on April 24, 2015 with a vote of 16 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

Evidence presented in a faculty member's dossier should exhibit high fidelity among budgeted time and the actual record of the faculty member's activities related to teaching, research, and service. **Assignments should approximate this budgeted time.** Specific due dates for the review process will be determined for each academic year based on the approved timeline established by the College of Education. Although it is preferred that a faculty member submit a written request to the Department Head for promotion and/or tenure consideration in their 4th year of rank, an assistant professor may also choose to be considered for promotion and tenure by the 1st of September during their 5th year of rank. Associate professors pursuing promotion to professor may request consideration when he or she has determined professional readiness. A faculty member who is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure also should work closely with her or his Mentoring Committee and the Department Head in preparing the dossier.

The careers of faculty members are by nature dynamic as faculty continue to develop professionally. Expectations of faculty members change as they advance in rank. One important principle underlying faculty development is that faculty members are reflective about their work in teaching, research, and service. This principle implies faculty actively consider their practices in the three core elements of the professorship and that these areas are reflected in their professional development. As stipulated in the University's Guidelines for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, "Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional and national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level." To move from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor: "Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. Unless the candidates' assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature."

In the evidence for contributions for teaching, research, and service, we distinguish between *primary* evidence and *additional* evidence. Clear and convincing evidence is found in **Primary Evidence**, which refers to activities that *all but the most unusual* applications for tenure and promotion should discuss and that the department values strongly in tenure and promotion decisions. **Additional evidence** refers to activities that the department also values but for which successful applications for tenure and promotion will provide *some but not necessarily all* of this evidence. This additional evidence will naturally vary as a function of the specific assigned time of various faculty members. This additional evidence will strengthen the faculty member's case for promotion.

I. Contributions to Teaching

The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarship. Teaching includes formal classroom instruction, advising, and mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and colleagues within and outside of the University. Faculty are expected to teach at a level that reflects their breadth and depth of scholarship and demonstrates evidence of an

emerging stature (for those pursuing the rank of Associate Professor) or national or international recognition (for those pursuing the rank of Professor). Effectiveness for teaching is found in the candidate's performance and "reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum (p. 14, University Guidelines)." The Department of Educational Psychology operationalized this clear and convincing effectiveness with primary and secondary evidence as noted below. Contained within some of the evidence markers below are scales of performance which document the candidate attained either emerging national stature or national or international recognition to move to the next rank. These evidence markers are delineated by rank.

As outlined below, the **Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence** required by department for promotion and tenure decisions related to teaching is derived from three areas: Teaching Effectiveness, Student Supervision, and Maintenance of Relevant Licensures and Certifications. **Additional Evidence** from five areas representing contributions to teaching (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Teaching Accomplishments, Instructional Development, Student Supervision, and Scholarship Related to Teaching) may be presented to augment a candidate's dossier.

Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Teaching

Although effective teaching should be strived for at all stages during a faculty's career, it is recognized growth may occur in the early stages as faculty develop expertise and receive mentoring related to good college teaching. Thus, evaluation of teaching effectiveness should be carried out with a growth mindset at these early stages. Faculty seeking promotion from assistant to associate should show *positive change in performance* as they proceed to promotion and gain expertise related to teaching. Faculty seeking promotion from associate to full should show *sustained commitment to teaching excellence* since the previous promotion.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

- Assistant → Full
 - Display of advanced disciplinary knowledge related to the course topic and;
 - Effectiveness shown by median student evaluation ratings above the center of the response scale (e.g., 3 on a 5-point scale) and;
 - Effectiveness in classroom teaching shown by peer evaluation.
This evaluation should be more comprehensive than a single observation of teaching carried out by a single faculty member, and should include broader evidence regarding teaching effectiveness, including evaluation of syllabi, assignments and assessments, and, if relevant, course activities and course websites for online courses.

2. Student Supervision

- Assistant → Full: Effective student advising and mentoring, as evidenced by;
 - Advisee performance towards degree objectives;
 - Discipline-specific mentoring;
 - Active participation on master's thesis and doctoral dissertation committees; and
 - Serving as chair of masters or dissertation committee, as appropriate to rank.

- Associate → Full:
 - Graduation of advisees; and
 - Publications and/or presentations with students

3. Maintenance of relevant licensures and certifications

- Assistant → Full: when necessary to carry out adequate student supervision and indicated in the letter of hire

B. Additional Evidence for Teaching

1. Teaching Effectiveness

- Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students, including publications and presentations at scholarly conferences
- Student comments on course evaluations

2. Teaching Accomplishments

- Honors and recognitions received for teaching
- Grants related to instruction
- Election to offices, committee activities as related to teaching
- Innovative instructional practices

3. Instructional Development

- Development of or significant revision of programs and courses
- Departmental and institutional governance; academic policy and procedure development related to curriculum and instruction

4. Student Supervision

- Student accomplishments before and after graduation
- Student testimony as indicated by recommendations, letters, and exit surveys

5. Scholarship Related to Teaching

- Publication activities directly related to college teaching

II. Contributions to Research

Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of programmatic research in their area of expertise. An important manifestation of programmatic research is faculty conducting and disseminating research appropriate to their discipline. **Interdisciplinary and collaborative** works are valid forms of scholarly activity and will be judged positively when the faculty member's intellectual contribution to the interdisciplinary work is clear.

Faculty whose budgeted time includes research must demonstrate high quality in these endeavors. The University distinguishes between the routine and the outstanding as judged by the candidate's peers at the University of Georgia and elsewhere. The standard should always be

quality rather than quantity, at all levels, but faculty seeking to be promoted to professor are expected to be recognized as among the leaders of their fields.

As outlined below, the **Primary Evidence** required by department for promotion and tenure decisions related to research is derived from four **Primary Discipline-Specific** areas: Publications, Leadership in Research, Presentations, and Grants/Contracts. **Additional Evidence** from eight areas representing contributions to research (i.e. Publications; Leadership in Research; Presentations; Editorial Roles; Product Development; Theory into Practice; and Student Supervision of Research) may be presented to augment a candidate's dossier.

A. Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Research

1. Publications

- Assistant→Full: Peer-reviewed manuscripts, *at least some of which*: are data-based, including simulated data; demonstrate scholarly independence from senior collaborators; and are first authored. The candidate's scholarship and research should be comparable in quality and quantity to that of individuals seeking promotion to this rank in their field in nationally recognized programs, and;
- Assistant→Full: The research should have a focus and impact on the field or society and;
- Associate→Full: scholarship-driven book, through a national or international publisher OR a *Grant/Contract* as described below). The candidate can exempt this requirement by demonstrating success in obtaining extramural funding to support research (see below).

2. Leadership in Research

- Assistant→Associate: emerging national or international reputation around research, as acknowledged by external evaluators. Specifically, the expectation is for involvement in research activities that create new knowledge and advance the faculty member's specific discipline. The candidate shall have an established program of research that makes an important contribution to the body of knowledge in the candidate's discipline at the national level. Evidence of this emerging national or international research reputation also will be evaluated by both the departmental faculty and external evaluators.
- Associate→Full: established national or international reputation around research, as acknowledged by external evaluators and through citations of published works indicating high levels of national or internal recognition and the likelihood of maintaining such stature

3. Presentations

- Assistant→Full: Presentation of research papers before professional meetings

4. Grants/Contracts

- Assistant→Associate: emerging grantsmanship, as required in the letter of offer, targeting internal or extramural sources; this work might include grants submitted but not received;

- Associate→Full: Success in obtaining extramural funding to support research should be evident, at least some of which demonstrates scholarly independence from senior collaborators. This does not exclude team collaborations in which the Associate has demonstrated a significant scholarly contribution. The candidate can exempt this requirement with a *scholarship-driven book* (see above).

B. Additional Evidence for Research

1. Non-refereed Publications

Books, parts of books, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, discipline-specific publications, articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors such as contractual or technical reports to a funding agency, accepted manuscripts, research notes, and bulletins.

2. Leadership in Research

- Honors and recognitions received for research.
- Offices held and committee assignments performed for scholarly and professional associations
- Innovative research.
- Development and organization of scholarly conferences

3. Workshops or Other Scholarly Talks

- Activities in which there was significant use of the candidate's expertise to community and government agencies, professional and industrial associations, and educational institutions.

4. Other Contributions to Grants and Contracts

- Consultant on grant, site liaison where grant work engaged, or other contributing role
- Review of grants applications

5. Editorial Roles

- Editorship or membership on editorial boards.
- Scholarly reviews of publications
- Scholarly reviews of research papers for presentation at conferences

6. Product Development

- Patents and new product development.
- Test development
- New computer programs and other technological or other creative products.

7. Theory into Practice

- Application of research scholarship in the field.
- New or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, and educational institutions.
- Technology transferred or adapted in the field.

- Evidence of impact on society of research scholarship and creative accomplishments.

8. Student Supervision of Research

- Mentorship of students for scholarly writing, grant, and other research-related activities.

III. Contributions to Service to Society, Outreach and Engagement

Service to society refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of unit and University missions. It can include applied research, service-based instruction, program and project management, and technical assistance. Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in departmental, school/college and/or University committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a college representative on a major University committee or task force); and developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects.

The faculty in the Department of Educational Psychology recognize the inconsistency between that which is stipulated in the letter of offer/University Guidelines and the lack of budgeted time allotted by the College of Education for service activities. Specifically, we recognize that in the preamble to this PTU document that our expectations and evaluations of faculty, to advance ranks, should be based on the relative accomplishment when weighed against assigned time. Although a typical faculty member might routinely engage in almost all of the service activities as an indicator of increasing national stature, our expectation does not go beyond service to the university to meet this unfunded requirement denoted by the letter of hire.

As outlined below, the **Primary Evidence** required by department for promotion and tenure decisions related to service is derived from two **Primary Discipline-Specific** areas: Program and Department and College and University. **Additional Evidence** from five areas representing contributions to service (i.e., Program and Department, College and University, National or International Roles, State and Regional Roles, and Local Schools and Community Roles) may be presented to augment a candidate's dossier.

A. Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Service

1. Program and Department Committees and Governance

- Assistant → Full: Departmental program and departmental committee work, governance bodies, and related activities
- Assistant → Full: Satisfactory attendance at faculty and concentration area meetings

2. College and University Committees and Governance

- Associate → Full: College and University level program governance and committee work, and related activities

B. Additional Evidence for Service

1. Program and Department

- Supporting or mentoring colleagues in teaching, research, and/or service
 - Other committee work
2. College and University
- Contracts, grants and gifts received or earned related to service activities.
 - Consultation and technical assistance.
3. National, International, and Professional Organization Roles
- Copyrights, patents and inventions related to service activities.
 - Selection for special service activities outside the state or nation.
 - Requests by individuals from outside the state or nation to study the candidate's work and innovations.
 - Governance bodies and related activities.
 - Service on grant review panels.
 - Leadership service for professional organizations indicating a reputation at the national and international levels
4. State and Regional Roles
- Consultation, outreach, and technical assistance.
 - Performance of clinical activities.
 - Governance bodies and related activities.
 - Awards for Service
5. Local Schools and Community Organizations Roles
- Service-based instructional activities.
 - Service products.
 - Governance bodies, partnerships, and related activities.

Tenure

Candidates for tenure in the Department of Educational Psychology must have a record of exemplary performance in the discharge of their primary responsibilities in teaching, research, and service to society, the University, and the profession. Tenure is granted only at the ranks of, or coincident with promotion to, associate professor and professor. A recommendation for tenure in the Department will require performance at the level specified for the rank at which either or both is being sought as described in the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of The University of Georgia* and in the previous sections of this document. In addition, tenure in the Department of Educational Psychology will be recommended only if there is a continuing and long-range need for the duties and responsibilities that might be expected of the candidate in the future, and if the candidate is likely to continue to be an active and productive scholar as measured by high levels of productivity and maintenance of scholarly standing.