University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
univcouncil@uga.edu
www.uga.edu

University Council

To: President Jere W. Morehead

Re: Recommendations of the University Council from the October 16, 2024, Meeting

Document Number: 2024.10.16.06

Issue: A proposal from the Faculty Affairs Committee for proposed revisions of guidelines for Lecturers.

Discussion: None.

Action: The vote was called, and the proposal was approved.

Submitted by: Fiona Liken — 10/18/24
Fiona Liken, Secretary — Date

- [x] Approved
- [ ] Reconsider
- [ ] Vetoed (see attached explanation)
- [ ] Received

Jere W. Morehead, President — 10/22/24
Date

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 (e.g., academic advising, curriculum or course development, academic program management, research, service) 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 effectiveness 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.

3. Appointment/Promotion Unit 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 fewer 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.

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

I. APPOINTMENT
Full-time regular faculty with teaching responsibilities are eligible to vote on the appointment of lecturers.

II. PROMOTION
The following are eligible to vote on the promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers: Associate Professors, Professors, non-tenure track faculty with teaching responsibilities and promoted at least one rank above the entry-level rank, Principal Lecturers, and Senior Lecturers.

The following are eligible to vote on the promotion of Senior Lecturers to Principal Lecturers: Professors, Associate Professors, non-tenure track faculty with teaching responsibilities and promoted to the highest rank within the track, and Principal Lecturers.

For third-year review and promotion, if the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc unit faculty committee.

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.

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 Ceiling on Appointments

The combined number of Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal 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.

Exceptions to the maximum number of Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers within any college or school may be approved by the Vice President for Instruction based on the professional credentials of prospective appointees as related to the instructional needs of the college or school. Such exceptions will be constrained by the Board of Regents policy § 8.3.8.2 as it applies to the maximum number of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers within the university.

4.2 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.

4.3 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.

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.

4.4 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 the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs.

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.

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, 4.4; 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. All dossiers for promotion, regardless of rank, must include consideration of the candidate's written annual evaluations for the time-period relevant to the review. For subsequent levels of review, only a summary of the annual evaluations should be included in the unit head's cover letter.

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. Lecturers 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 must include a Vita (Section 4, twelve page maximum) including a Summary of Major Accomplishments (two page maximum), and a Teaching Portfolio (Section 5) including a Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness. The combined length of the dossier cannot exceed 25 pages. 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 voting faculty

members who are familiar with the unique roles and responsibilities of Lecturers. Under usual circumstances, the third-year review committee consists of the eligible voting faculty in the unit, as defined in Section 3.II above. If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc third-year review unit faculty committee. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about their progress toward promotion at the University of Georgia.

For each third-year review, 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 faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the third-year review. The faculty member may reply in writing to the report within 10 working days and any reply becomes part of the report. Within 5 working days from the faculty member's reply, the PTU head will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the third-year review made because of the faculty member's written reply. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.

If the performance in any of the faculty member's assigned areas of effort is judged to be not successful, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The PTU head will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from the third-year review committee. The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member and remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period. The PRP must be approved by the Dean. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

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.

The primary responsibility of the Lecturer track is classroom instruction, which may include Student Success Activities, as appropriate. Contributions related to service, research, and administrative responsibilities are expected only for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Principal Lecturers whose Offer Letter (or 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 (see number 1 below) and further evidence of effectiveness of instruction from one of the numbered categories (see numbers 2-9 below).
For promotion to Principal Lecturer, a candidate must show evidence of student learning or positive student outcomes (see number 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 (see numbers 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 during time in rank should be included. 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.
    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. Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, or international study and development projects.
   c. Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams or special commissions.
   d. 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 if research and service responsibilities are indicated in the Offer Letter (or addendums to Offer Letter).

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 six years, including the year in which the review is occurring. 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 submit their dossier for promotion to Senior Lecturer in the sixth year of employment as a Lecturer. Preliminary consideration should occur, in the normal course, in spring of the fifth year.

If a unit head desires to reappoint a Lecturer beyond the sixth 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 Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs 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.

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).

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 effectiveness 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 unit 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 Sections 4 (Vita and Summary of Major Accomplishments, not to exceed 12 pages total) and 5 (Teaching Portfolio). The vita should contain a statement of Major Accomplishments (two page maximum). The Teaching portfolio should contain a teaching philosophy statement and evidence of teaching effectiveness. Sections 4 and 5 should not exceed 25 pages in total. The unit 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, and the third-year review report and any responses. The unit 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. If the unit containing the position has

insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad promotion review unit faculty committee. 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 unit head and the candidate. First, a dossier must be prepared for evaluation by the appropriate unit 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 unit head and the candidate, with the candidate having the final say about the dossier's contents. Appendix A describes the elements required for the dossier. NOTE: For purposes of the unit'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. The combined length of Sections 4 (Vita and Summary of Major Accomplishments) and 5 (Teaching Portfolio) should not exceed 25 pages.

- 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.
- Section 4 Vita. 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 teaching and other responsibilities for which time was allocated (i.e., research, service, administration). An example of a Vita format is found in Appendix B. A Statement of Major Accomplishments (not to exceed 2 pages) should be included after the Vita.
- Section 5 Teaching Portfolio. The candidate should include a Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness, which documents evidence of appropriate teaching accomplishments (see Section 5.3), including Student Success Activities, as appropriate, in a teaching portfolio and explain how the requirements for the requested rank have been met (see Section 2).

6.5 Promotion Unit Evaluation

Normally, the promotion dossier will be subject to three levels of review: the first review takes place within the unit, when it renders its recommendation concerning promotion. Following this review by the unit, the dossier will be reviewed at the college/school 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 college/school serves as the promotion unit. All reviews must be conducted in a rigorous and equitable manner and must be free of political influence.

Voting Procedures for Units: All eligible voting faculty are expected to participate in the unit evaluation process by voting yes or no. Faculty from the candidate's unit 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 unit 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 unit head convenes the eligible voting faculty (p. 2) to conduct the unit evaluation. Eligible faculty within the unit will vote by secret ballot, except for the unit 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 unit 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 Sections 1 (UGA Promotion Recommendation Form, see Appendix C), 2 (Cover Letter), and 6 (Offer Letter and any addenda, and Third Year Review and any responses) of the dossier. If the unit head voted against the promotion, then the candidate may designate a senior faculty member from the unit to substitute for the unit head.

This person prepares Section 2; the unit 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 unit head voted against the candidate, the dossier goes forward with a cover letter from the unit head (or their designee). In the event that the unit vote was negative, the unit head, regardless of their vote, will summarize the deliberation for the unit'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 unit faculty. Whether or not the unit head prepares the cover letter, he/she (or designee) is responsible for preparing a summary of the procedural steps followed by the unit 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 unit 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 College/School Review

Colleges/Schools without Departments
In those colleges or schools without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the first level of review takes place within the college/school, which serves as the promotion unit and follows all procedures for the unit review as outlined in the previous section. This review takes place in accordance with the college/school'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 promotion unit head. The college/school should establish written procedures for the selection of the promotion unit head.

Colleges/Schools with Departments
In those colleges or schools with departments, the first level of review takes place in the unit in accordance with its criteria for promotion. Upon completion of that first-level review, the unit will transmit the candidate's dossier to the college/school review committee(s) in accordance with the procedures outlined above. At that time, the candidate, unit 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/school 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 unit.

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 unit level).

b. *Appointment and Composition of the College/School Committees*. The Dean appoints the members of the college/school review committee(s); these Guidelines recommend that such committees consist of at least five eligible faculty members of the college/school and must include representation at the Senior or Principal Lecturer rank as appropriate.

c. Voting Procedures for Colleges/Schools with Departments.
   - *Quorum* - Of the faculty 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. To count toward quorum, faculty members attending remotely, consistent with the unit's policies on remote meeting attendance, must be able to fully participate in the meeting and vote only after the discussion, when the question is called.
   - *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 unit.
   - *Absentee Ballots* - No absentee ballots are allowed.
   - *Recommendations* - The unit'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 college/school review committee concludes that a procedural error exists that has not been properly evaluated or remedied at the unit level.
   - *Voting* - Voting will be conducted by secret ballot with two designated faculty members assigned to count the ballots.

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

   1. Remand the case to the unit if such 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 unit level or a record worthy of promotion. A finding of such fatal procedural error by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible college/school review committee members will nullify a negative unit 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/school 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 unit vote. A tie vote 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.

e. Regardless of the outcome of the college/school 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 college/school 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 college/school 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 college/school; (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 college/school.

   The dean (or their designee) will be ex-officio, non-voting member of the college/school review committee(s). After the vote has been taken at the college/school 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 Vice President of Instruction. The letter will include the vote of the appropriate faculty of the unit, as well as the vote of the college/school 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 Vice President of Instruction. 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 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 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 unit recommendation to the appropriate Dean or Vice President 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 level may be appealed. Appeal requests should be submitted in writing by the candidate to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, 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, consistent with the grounds listed below. This letter of request is the only new information allowed in the Appeals Process.

Appeals may be based either on (1) significant inaccuracies in the record of accomplishment by the candidate as submitted in the dossier or (2) 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 President and composed of faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate (see Section 3, Ranks of Eligible Voting Faculty), who will make its best judgment as to the existence of material failures, inaccuracies, or procedural irregularities; whether or not these failures, inaccuracies or irregularities significantly impaired an appropriate review of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. The committee's recommendation will be submitted to the responsible administrator at the appeal level. The President will consider the appeal committee's recommendation before making a final decision.

Appendix A. Dossier for Promotion

The purpose of this dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. It should be prepared in a concise manner. Sections 4 and 5 together should not exceed 25 pages; font size must be at least 11 point, all margins must be at least one inch, line spacing must not exceed six lines of text per vertical inch, and page size must be letter (8.5 inches X 11 inches). Appendices, including written annual evaluations and student end-of course evaluations, are not part of the formal dossier at the university-level review and should be available only upon request. All dossiers for promotion, regardless of rank, must include consideration by the unit of the candidate's written annual evaluations for the time-period relevant to the review. 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.

Section 2: Unit Head Cover Letter for Promotion or Reappointment
Summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's promotion or reappointment. 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), which may include Student Success Activities, as appropriate. Anchor these comments with references to the pages of the dossier where the evidence is presented. Briefly summarize the written annual evaluations since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank.
C. *Assessment of the Candidate's Stature.* Evaluate the candidate's stature within the unit and/or college/school. Again, anchor these comments with references to the pages in the dossier where the evidence is presented.
D. *Need for Services*. For reappointment, summarize the demonstrated exceptional teaching ability, extraordinary value to the institution, and continued need for the Lecturer.

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: Vita (12 page maximum)

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 service, research, administrative, and/or other responsibilities for which time was allocated. See Appendix B for a suggested format for the CV.

The candidate should add to the end of the vita a statement no longer than two pages that describes the candidate's major accomplishments. As the primary responsibility of the Lecturer track is classroom instruction, the "Major Accomplishments" document should describe significant instructional accomplishments and activities during the time under consideration for promotion. Additional service, research, and/or administrative accomplishments/activities should be included if indicated in the Offer Letter and/or addendums throughout the period under review,

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.

- Statement of Teaching Philosophy

- Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
- 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 Promotion Dossier 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 and any responses should be included.

Appendix B. Recommended Vita Format

In an effort to produce a more uniform reporting procedure, the following outline is recommended for the vita in promotion dossier. At a minimum, the vita should reflect responsibilities and expectations as specified in the Offer Letter and any addendums to the Offer Letter.

A. 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.)

B. 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

C. 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
D. Public service (as applicable)
   1. Extension
   2. International programs
   3. Local community services and relations, and
   4. To governmental and nongovernmental agencies
E. 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 C: Letter Template for Requesting Evaluation for Promotion (Optional)

This letter template should be used for all requests for external evaluations for promotion. The unit head may add clarifying information to the letter of request as appropriate including, but not limited to the candidate's allocation of effort, and should not include the outcome of the preliminary vote.

Dear YYYYY:

The University of Georgia is considering the promotion of Dr. X to the rank of Z.
To aid us in rendering a wise promotion recommendation, we seek a thoughtful evaluation of the candidate's contributions. You have been recommended to us as a person who is in a position to evaluate the contributions made by X. We do not ask for your judgment about the candidate as a person. Instead, we seek your professional judgment of the impact and quality of X's contributions. As you are not asked to review the entire dossier, you need not provide an overall opinion whether the candidate likely would be promoted at the University of Georgia or your institution. Specifically, we are interested in the following:

1. Length and nature of relationship with the candidate.
2. Your judgment of the quality and significance of the candidate's contributions. (Option added: unit head may include work examples [reprints, books, or other evidence of teaching or other contributions] upon which we would particularly value your professional judgment.)
3. The candidate's professional reputation and standing as relative to outstanding people in the same field at approximately the same stage of development.

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

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Appendix D. Lecturer Track Promotion or Reappointment Dossier Checklist

Name_____ Current
Rank_____
Department _____ .
College/School_____
Recommendation For: (check one)
___Promotion ___Reappointment ___Do Not Reappoint
Promotion to: (check one) ___Senior Lecturer ___Principal Lecturer
Contract Type: (check one) ___Fiscal ___Academic

Items in Dossier (*Ensure all items are included in the electronic dossier (pdf format) at each level of review*)	√ or N/A
Table of Contents	
Section 1: UGA Recommendation for Promotion Form (N/A for reappointment)	
Section 2: Unit Head Cover Letter(s) for Promotion or Reappointment	
Dean's Cover Letter(s) (not a part of unit-level dossier)	
College/School Review Committee Written Rationale and Vote (not a part of unit-level dossier) (N/A for reappointment)	
Candidate's Letter(s) of Response (as applicable)	
Section 3: Unit Criteria (as applicable)	
Section 4*: Curriculum Vita and Statement of Major Accomplishments (12 pages maximum)	
Curriculum Vita Candidate's Statement of "Major Accomplishments" (two page maximum)	
Section 5*: The Teaching Portfolio including involvement in Student Success Activities, as applicable and a summary of Annual Evaluations for the time-period relevant to the review. Statement of Teaching Philosophy Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness Service to the University, the Profession or Society (if applicable) Research, Scholarship or Other Creative Activities (if applicable)	
Section 6: Letter of Offer (include statement of any approved changes in assignment)	
Third-Year Review (for Lecturers only) (including any responses)	
Optional Section 7*: Brief Statement of Qualifications of Each External or Internal Evaluator	

Identification of Evaluation Letters from Candidate's List vs Unit's List	
Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation (optional)	
External Letters of Evaluation	
Additional Letters (e.g., former students, close associates, peer review of teaching)	

*Sections 4 and 5 together should not exceed 25 pages, font size must be at least 11 point, all margins must be at least one inch, line spacing must not exceed six lines of text per vertical inch, and page size must be letter (8.5 inches X 11 inches).

NOTE: Do not submit appendices, including written annual evaluations or student end-of-course evaluations, for university level review.

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