

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

Effective August 1, 2019

Department Revisions April 2019, May 2021, November 2022, August 2023

Dean Approval August, 14 2023

Provost Approval September 10, 2023

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: https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/Guidelines_for_Appointment_Promotion_Tenure_of_Academic_Rank_Faculty_8-1-2023_3.pdf). 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 both University and PTU 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 and University guidelines and policy, 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. A quorum (two-thirds of the tenured faculty) should be present for this vote. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal their 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 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 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 reflect insufficient progress toward promotion and/or tenure, the PTU head, third-year review committee, and faculty member must develop a Performance Remediate Plan (PRP). 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 generated by third-year review should be harmonized with a PRP generated by annual review, as needed, and must be approved by the Dean. The faculty member will have one year from the most recent updated of the PRP to demonstrate a trajectory of appropriate progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

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. University Guidelines require five years in rank at the Associate Professor level, absent unusual circumstances and justification allowing the faculty member to go up early for Professor. 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/Scholarship, Service, and Administration** (as applicable). In accordance with the UGA Academic Affairs Policy 1.10-10 (<https://provost.uga.edu/policies/academic-affairs-policy-manual/1-10-promotion-process/>), Student Success Activities are evaluated within any area of effort or efforts, as appropriate. The following criteria are applied in each area: Does Not Meet Expectations, Needs Improvement, Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, and Exemplary. 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 (approximately 2 pages to assist the committee in their evaluation. The personal statement is necessary for making reasonable and fair assessments of annual performance. 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 rubric. In addition, neither the UGA Elements Activity Summary nor the faculty member's curriculum vitae fully documents the depth of work with students. Faculty members are requested to provide a description of their contributions to student success in any area of effort, as appropriate, as evaluated in their personal statement. Faculty may address extenuating circumstances in their personal statements. The personal statement also allows for further explanation of any variance from a typical profile. Each year, faculty are required to submit a personal statement, a copy of the UGA Elements Activity Summary, and a CV. Failure to submit an annual evaluation or partial submission will result in an annual evaluation rating of Does Not Meet Expectations.

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 MFECOE 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 MFECOE, and Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document. This iteration of the document was approved on March 8th, 2019 with a vote of 13 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. The standard allocation of effort is 40% teaching (1 three credit course is equivalent to 10% effort), 40% research, and 20% 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 MFECOE. 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. University Guidelines require five years in rank at the Associate Professor level, absent unusual circumstances and justification allowing the faculty member to go up early for Professor. 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 per the criteria listed in part III, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure and the criteria established by their PTU” 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 per the criteria listed in part III, Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure, and the criteria established by their PTU. 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 (currently page 6 of the 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. The standard allocation of effort to teaching is 40% effort, with 1 three credit course being equivalent to 10% effort.

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. See Academic Affairs Policy Statement on Improvement and Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness <https://reg.uga.edu/faculty-governance/academic-affairs-policies/#row23>

1. Teaching Effectiveness

- *Assistant* → *Associate* → *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)
- *Assistant* → *Associate*
 - 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. This must include evaluation of syllabi, assignments and assessments, and, if relevant, course activities and course websites for online courses. (See Department's Peer Evaluation of Faculty's Teaching for Tenure and Promotion Policy)

2. Student Supervision

- *Assistant* → *Associate* → *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* → *Associate* → *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. The standard allocation of effort towards research is 40%.

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., Non-refereed Publications; Leadership in Research; Workshops or Other Scholarly Talks; Other Contributions to Grants and Contracts; Editorial Roles; Product Development; Theory into Practice; Student Supervision of Research) may be presented in addition to primary evidence to augment a candidate's dossier.

A. Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Research

1. Publications

- *Assistant* → → *Associate* → *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*→→ *Associate* →*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*→*Associate*→*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. Standard allocation of effort towards service, outreach, and engagement for is 20%.

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*→*Associate*→*Full*: Departmental program and departmental committee work, governance bodies, and related activities
- *Assistant*→*Associate*→*Full*: Satisfactory attendance at faculty and concentration area meetings, participating in recruitment of new faculty (attending colloquiums, meeting with candidates).

2. College and University Committees and Governance

- *Assistant*→*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
- Writing letters of recommendation for students and colleagues
- Program and departmental 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 and open-source resources.
- Selection for special service activities outside the state or nation.
- Work intensively with individuals from outside the state or nation to study the work and expertise of faculty member.
- Peer review/evaluations of departments, organization, programs of work, work product (e.g., assessment package/system).
- Writing letters for faculty outside of UGA (e.g., promotion and tenure, letters of support for awards).
- Governance bodies and related activities.
- Service on grant review panels.
- Leadership service for professional organizations indicating a reputation at the national and international levels.
- Awards for service

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.
- Awards for service

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 Academic Rank Faculty* of The University of Georgia and in the previous sections of this document. (i.e., tenure requires five years, and faculty cannot continue untenured more than seven years). 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.