Excerpted from the Bylaws of the
Department of Educational Theory and Practice
as amended April 2015

E. Promotion and Tenure

In all matters related to appointment, promotion, and tenure, the Department of Educational Theory and Practice will carefully follow and adhere to the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* approved by the University Council on April 22, 2004 and revised spring 2014. The procedures and criteria set forth in this document are intended to supplement and clarify how the *Guidelines* will be viewed within the context of the departmental faculty's scholarly fields. The document provides specific information on procedures that will be followed and on the criteria for promotion and for tenure in the Department of Educational Theory and Practice. Questions not addressed in this document can be answered by referring to the University *Guidelines*. All faculty members are expected to be familiar with this document and the University *Guidelines*. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this document does not address a certain issue, the University *Guidelines* will supersede this document.

E.1. Overview of Department

The Department of Educational Theory and Practice comprises six main academic areas: critical studies in education, teacher education, early childhood education, elementary education, middle school education, and social studies education. The primary goals of the department are to prepare teachers for preschools, elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools, and to prepare teacher educators, researchers, and other education professionals for higher education institutions and other agencies. The graduate programs in elementary and secondary education are perennially ranked by *U.S. News and World Report* among the top five programs in the country, and the department has much to do with the fact that the University of Georgia is a national leader in the number of graduates licensed to teach.

Examples of research areas include teaching and learning in all the subject areas of the school curriculum, culture and pedagogy, early educational intervention, education for democracy, the history of education, the professional development of teachers and teacher educators, reflective practice, the roles of families and communities in schooling, school reform and policy, schooling and social justice, and teacher-student relationships, among other areas.

E.2. Appointments

In all matters relating to the search and appointment of new faculty members, the Department of Educational Theory and Practice will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* (especially Section V, Procedures for Appointment, p. 23-24) and will follow the time-tables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education.

E.3 Third Year Review

The University *Guidelines* (pp. 25-26) call for a formative review of assistant professors at the end of the third year of appointment. By no later than the third week of January of the third year, the Department Head will appoint a committee of at least two department faculty members to guide the review process. The committee should, if possible, include mentors previously assigned to work with the candidate.

By no later than the first week of March of the third year, the assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to the vita, accomplishments (2-page document) and achievements sections (12-page document) of the promotion dossier described in the *Guidelines*, Appendix C. The Department Head and the committee will advise the candidate on the contents of the dossier and will ensure its accuracy.

The committee will review the dossier, publications, and peer and student evaluations of teaching, and any other material it requests of the candidate. It will use the departmental and university criteria for promotion as its standard for assessing the candidate. The committee will present its findings on the candidate's progress toward promotion (for clinical-track faculty) or promotion and tenure (for tenure-track faculty) at a meeting of the respective senior voting body (clinical or tenured) in the department to be held no later than May 1 of the third year.

The appropriate faculty body will vote *Yes* or *No* on the following question: Has [candidate's name] made sufficient progress toward promotion (clinical-track) or promotion and tenure (tenure-track)

On the basis of the discussion and the vote, the Department Head will draft the third-year review letter, solicit feedback from the specific voting body, revise the letter as appropriate, and provide the letter to the candidate. The Department Head will meet with the candidate to discuss the review. The candidate may respond in writing to the review letter and that response will become part of the review letter. The full letter, including any response, will be filed and must be included in the promotion (or promotion and tenure) dossier when it is developed.

E.4. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

"University of Georgia faculty must meet the following primary responsibilities: teaching; research, scholarship or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. Academic appointment, promotion and tenure are based upon a candidate's performance in these assigned areas." (*Guidelines*, p. 13).

Contributions to Teaching

"Teaching communicates knowledge to students and develops in them the desire and skills necessary to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarship. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students." *(Guidelines p. 14)*

The department holds that good teaching cannot be encapsulated solely in course evaluation numbers, in degrees of course innovation, or in raw numbers of advisees. The department believes that good teaching is manifested in a complex array of behaviors, dispositions, and indicators. These include but are not limited to:

- Courses whose design includes clear objectives, effective organization, and current content; course activities and assignments that are clearly related to the course goals and are useful in promoting learning; feedback that is useful and timely; evaluation that is based on clearly stated expectations.
- An instructor who is knowledgeable and well-prepared for each class meeting; who is receptive to student input and reflective about the pedagogy, monitoring student mastery of new skills and knowledge and adjusting instruction as appropriate; who challenges students to rise to their fullest potential as learners.
- Formal and informal student and peer evaluations that are positive.
- Non-classroom instructional duties commensurate with budgeted time, usually one-third of an instructional load. These duties include advising and mentoring students. Thus, the department expects faculty to carry a fair share of their program's advisees, independent study opportunities, thesis and dissertation committees and major advisor roles, *as appropriate to the specific needs of each program and with due regard to the faculty member's rank.* The quality of this sort of instruction is as important as quantity. Untenured assistant professors are expected to carry a lighter advisement and mentoring load than tenured and clinical faculty.
- Instruction-related activities that enhance departmental and program capacity, coherence and excellence, such as course revision, innovations in course content or delivery, collaboration with one another, and new course and program development. While such activities are encouraged, especially constant critical reflection on course content that might lead to course revision or innovation, there is no expectation that such activities result in new products on a regular basis.

Contributions to Research

"Inquiry and originality are central functions of the University. Faculty members are to discover new ideas, to fashion new interpretations of enduring ideas, and to participate in the application of these ideas. Consequently, faculty members should conduct research or engage in other creative activities appropriate to their disciplines and to the missions of their appointment units, and they should disseminate the results of their work through media appropriate to their disciplines. Interdisciplinary and collaborative works are valid forms of scholarly activity and will be judged as such as long as each candidate gives clear evidence of his/her participation in each instance. Faculty whose work assignments include research or other creative activities should clearly 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 principal standard should always be quality rather than quantity." (*Guidelines,*, *pp. 16-17.)*

The diversity among the faculty in areas of research, foundational disciplines, and methodologi-

cal approaches is a significant strength of the department. It also results in a rich variety of scholarly work produced for particular constituencies that the faculty seeks to serve and influence. The department therefore values, and chooses to reward in its criteria for promotion and for tenure, multiple and varied ways of demonstrating scholarly excellence. In all cases, excellence within the selected approach and meaningful influence on a community of researchers or other practitioners are the ultimate criteria. Mindful of the university's assertion that "The principal standard [for judgments regarding scholarship] should always be quality rather than quantity," the department expects the following from the faculty:

- Faculty members will provide evidence of active, productive, and continually engaged scholarship proportionate to budgeted time.
- The body of scholarship developed by a faculty member will be coherent; that is, it should, for the most part, be directed toward a clear research question, or develop a clear line of research, though a researcher may, over a number of years, move from one question to another. A substantial portion of a faculty member's scholarship should provide evidence of the author's own conceptualizations and conclusions.
- The body of scholarship developed by a faculty member will create new knowledge and advance the individual's discipline.
- The record of publication must be consistent, though it is explicitly understood that as researchers move from one area of research to another, there will be gaps in the record.
- Publications will be in venues (journals, publishers, websites, etc.) that are at least nationally regarded.
- As appropriate to individual faculty members' disciplines, programs, and research focus, grantsmanship will be encouraged and considered as a part of the overall contribution to scholarship, though failure to win grants will not, in and of itself, disqualify a faculty member from meeting or exceeding expectations.
- Acceptable modes of dissemination embrace multiple forms, including publication in books, book chapters, articles, book reviews, editorials, reports, and other forms of publication, either print or on-line; conference presentations, invited addresses, and other oral presentations; creative products, such as film, exhibitions, visual arts, and other artistic works, as appropriate to the discipline and the line of inquiry.
- Presentations are valuable for dissemination and to gain critical feedback, though the goal will be forms of publication that reach broader audiences.
- Peer-reviewed publication in selective journals is one important marker of scholarly stature and quality of research; however, because it is not always an infallible marker of impact, other measures of impact may be considered. These might include, among other things, invited contributions (addresses, chapters, collaborations, etc.); invitations to review or referee the scholarship of others; or dissemination of non-refereed scholarship that had a demonstrable impact, with evidence of that impact.
- The quality and quantity of scholarship will be comparable to that of peers at nationally-recognized institutions.

We also commit ourselves to giving faculty the opportunity to grow in their work; that is, we expect excellence as an outcome, not as a starting point. Faculty members who struggle with their teaching or research are given specific and regular feedback and opportunities to improve. Furthermore, we understand that student ratings and comments must always be interpreted carefully,

that our taking seriously student concerns must be balanced with our expecting excellence of them, as we do of each other.

Contributions to Service

"*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.

"*Service to the profession* includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; and review of grants applications." (*Guideline*s, *pp. 18-19*)

The department expects all faculty members to be active in the governance of the department, college, and university, and to render their expertise and time to other communities – local, professional, or other. That service is different from the sort of service for which some faculty members are budgeted and that is defined contractually; it is service that is occasionally referred to as institutional citizenship; it is service without which the institution cannot survive. Justice and fairness dictate that these forms of service be expected of every member of the body. The criteria for service include:

- Participation in departmental affairs, including attending and contributing to department meetings, meeting committee assignments, responding in a timely manner to e-mail queries from the Department Head and colleagues, and in other ways contributing to the work of the department.
- Participation in college, university, and/or community (local, national, professional) organizations. This may include one or more of the following:
    - Contributing to the work of the college and university through service on college or university committees, boards, councils, work-groups, or other campus organizations;
    - Working with local organizations such as schools, local committees or boards, businesses, governmental agencies, Professional Development Schools, or others;
    - Holding office, reviewing book or article manuscripts, reviewing conference proposals, or rendering other service to regional or national professional organizations (excluding paper presentations)
    - Other forms of service to groups beyond the department that calls upon instructional or scholarly expertise.

The service expectations for tenure-track assistant professors are lower than for tenured associate and full professors. Assistant professors are expected to be active in departmental affairs, but

are not expected to take on substantial duties to the college, university or communities, particularly in their first two to three years. All others are expected to be actively involved in sustained service to the department and to other organizations.

For Tenure and/or for Promotion to Associate Professor

For tenure (tenure-track) and for promotion (clinical-track and tenure-track) to associate professor, candidates must "show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level" (*Guidelines, p.23*). The department measures clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as a regional or national authority by a preponderance of research output disseminated through regional and national venues, instructional output at least comparable to that of peers at nationally-recognized institutions, institutional service that contributes to the institution's self-governance, and professional service that benefits regional or national professional organizations, except when a faculty is budgeted for service, in which case emerging stature is understood to mean the performance of assigned duties with a high degree of independence and initiative.

For Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor (clinical-track and tenure-track), 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 candidate's assignments are specifically regional, they should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature." (*Guidelines, p. 23).* Promotion to professor requires attainment of a level of performance and scholarship in teaching, research and service beyond that required for an associate professor. The dossier should provide documentation of a well-established line of scholarship and research activities and a sustained impact in the candidate's field, a record of continued excellence in instructional obligations, and a record of leadership in institutional and professional service since the date of promotion to the rank associate professor.

E.5. Mentoring and Promotion

In all matters relating to the promotion of faculty members from any present rank to a higher rank, the Department of Educational Theory and Practice will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* (especially the standards and documentation specified in Section V, Procedures for Appointment, pp. 23-29) and will follow the time-tables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education.

As described in the University *Guidelines* (p. 25), new faculty members will be given a copy of the *Guidelines* and a copy of this document and will meet with the Department Head during the first semester of appointment to review procedures and criteria for promotion and tenure.

To support each new clinical-track or tenure-track faculty member during the first year, the Department Head will appoint one to three faculty mentors who will provide guidance about matters related to promotion or to promotion and tenure.

1. The Department Head serves as the temporary mentor for new faculty members.

2. By the end of fall semester, new faculty members should select their mentoring committee. The committee must consist of at least two faculty members. At least one of the committee members must be from the new faculty member's program area.

3. Mentoring committees must meet regularly, at least once per semester, with the new faculty member. Possible activities include discussing goals for the year, observing classes; providing feedback on manuscripts, grant proposals, and course evaluations; working on promotion format vita; and helping to make connections with other COE and UGA faculty.

4. The mentoring committee will remain in place until the new track faculty member submits promotion or promotion and tenure papers to the college. New faculty members can reconstitute their mentoring committees at any time in consultation with the Department Head.

The faculty takes seriously its commitment to mentoring one another in all aspects and all stages of members' careers. This involves consistent attention to how faculty members are developing and sustaining generative lines of inquiry, finding outlets and funding sources for their work, developing as instructors, puzzling out issues in teaching or research, balancing service with research and teaching demands, among other things. Though a great deal of mentoring happens in informal spaces, the department is committed to carving out formal places for relationship building and support as well. These may involve brown bag seminars (to share and get feedback on current work), peer observation and debriefing of one another's instruction, devoted small-group time during department meetings to solve problems, as well as formal mentoring partnerships or committees. Faculty members may need different kinds of mentoring at different stages of their careers (and according to the primary thrust of their work), and the department is committed to supporting colleagues along their individual trajectories. Such mentoring is critical if all members of the department are to reach their full potential as scholars and educators.

E.6. Preliminary Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

As stated in the University *Guidelines* (pp. 26-27), a candidate must request preliminary consideration for promotion (clinical-track) or promotion and tenure (tenure-track). At the beginning of the spring semester of the academic year preceding formal review, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion or promotion and tenure will submit this request in writing to the Department Head, along with an updated vita; a two-page summary of major accomplishments; all available teaching evaluations, including student comments, from at least the preceding three years; a list of up to six potential external evaluators, with a paragraph of biographical information and contact information for each evaluator; and, if the candidate chooses, a list of up to three people who may not be asked to serve as external evaluators.

All faculty eligible to vote on the candidate will have access to the vita, summary of accomplishments, and teaching evaluations submitted by the candidate. The eligible faculty will meet

to discuss the materials and will vote *Yes* or *No* on whether candidate should be formally reviewed for promotion and, if relevant, tenure.

If the vote at the meeting is to conduct the formal review, the Department Head will share with the eligible faculty members the candidate's list of potential external reviewers and solicit names of other potential external reviewers such that the final pool of reviewers who have agreed to participate will include two from the candidate's list and (preferably) three from the eligible faculty members' list. The eligible faculty will also establish the priority order in which the potential external reviewers will be contacted. None of those chosen as potential external reviewers may be the candidate's dissertation advisor, co-author, or co-principal investigator. It is generally expected that the external evaluators will be nationally recognized in the candidate's area of expertise, or a closely related area, and must be at or above the rank desired by the candidate (see p. 28 in the *Guidelines*).

E.7. Formal Review for Promotion and Tenure

Candidates eligible for promotion or promotion and tenure will work with the Department Head and/or the mentoring committee to prepare the dossier. In addition, the Department Head will solicit letters of evaluation from the five external reviewers following procedures in the *Guidelines (pp. 27-28)***.** There must be no contact at all between the candidate and the external reviewers during the promotion or promotion and tenure review. No submitted external review may be excluded from the final dossier.

The Department Head will secure agreements from evaluators and send them the candidate's materials by the end of May. On or before August 1, the candidate's full dossier, including external review letters, will be made available for review to all faculty members eligible to vote. The candidate's dossier will be considered at a meeting scheduled for this purpose before August 20, with a quorum consisting of at least two-thirds of the faculty who are eligible to vote. All eligible faculty members shall vote by secret ballot, "yes" or "no." Following the vote, the Department Head will announce how he/she voted. If the Department Head voted negatively, the promotion letter must be written by another faculty member selected by the candidate from among the faculty eligible to vote (*Guidelines*, p. 30).

E8. Tenure

The decision regarding tenure is separate from the decision regarding promotion. As the *Guidelines* explain, "Tenure is a status that serves the best interests not only of the individual, but also of the University itself in its role as an instrument of a democratic society. In our society and within the academy, we regard the search for knowledge to be of paramount importance, and tenure for faculty members provides protection for scholars to broadly discover and apply knowledge. The decision to grant tenure to a faculty member is an enduring commitment that affects the future and continued growth in stature of the University of Georgia and is therefore a process that must be handled rigorously and fairly." (p. 40).

In all matters relating to the tenure of faculty members, the Department of Educational Theory and Practice will follow the procedures and criteria specified in the University *Guidelines* (espe-

cially Section *X*, Procedures for Tenure, pp. 39-44) and will follow the time-tables, deadlines and other procedural routines specified by the College of Education. The procedures and criteria for granting tenure will follow the criteria set forth in the preceding section on Promotion.

On or before August 1, the candidate's dossier will be made available for review to all faculty members eligible to vote. The candidate's dossier will be considered at a meeting scheduled for this purpose before August 20, with a quorum consisting of at least two-thirds of the faculty who are eligible to vote. All eligible faculty members shall vote by secret ballot, "yes", or "no." Following the vote on each candidate, the Department Head will announce how he/she voted. If the Department Head voted negatively, the promotion letter must be written by another faculty member selected by the candidate from among the faculty eligible to vote (*Guidelines*, p. 30).

F. Annual Faculty Evaluation Policies and Processes

F.1. Principles Guiding the Annual Faculty Evaluation Policies and Processes:

The faculty evaluation process should:

- · Promote *faculty development*: provide an opportunity for annual discussion of faculty members' activities, goals, and needs.
- · Promote *transparency*: clearly delineate the decision-making process for evaluating faculty members' annual performances and recommending salary increases.
- · Promote *accountability*: faculty members document their activities in good faith; evaluations correspond with explicit criteria and are conducted in the spirit of advocacy.

F.2. Criteria Used for Annual Review (the Faculty Activity Critique)

The annual evaluation of faculty members' activities will be based on the ETAP promotion and tenure unit criteria. The evidence supporting the Faculty Activity Critique will consist of the information in the FAR and any supplemental material submitted by a faculty member, as listed in "Procedures and deadlines," below. ***Annual evaluations for faculty must be conducted according to the defined discipline-specific criteria. A faculty member's progress toward achieving the discipline-specific criteria must be clearly documented in writing.*** The Department Head will make a holistic assessment of each faculty member in terms of contributions to *teaching, scholarship,* and *service.* Due regard will be given to the program area context, faculty rank, budgeted time, and assignments.

Merit decisions will be based on contractually assigned time. The usual departmental assignment for tenure-track faculty is 50% for instruction, 50% for research and for clinical-track faculty is 75% for instruction, 25% for service, except as negotiated differently in writing. Faculty members who have different assignments, including budgeted *service* expectations, have an equal opportunity to receive merit increases with those carrying the usual assignment. The criteria described below will be weighed in accordance with individual assignments.

Based on holistic judgments of each individual's annual performance, each faculty member will be rated in one of three categories: *Did not Meet Expectations, Met Expectations,* and *Exceeded Expectations*, in each area of contribution (teaching, scholarship, and service). There will be no

expectation of a "normal distribution" of the faculty as a group across those categories; rather, each individual will be assessed relative to the criteria described under each area of contribution. However, due to institutional mandates, the Department Head is required to make distinctions among individuals within a specific category.

The Department of Educational Theory and Practice believes that contributions to the university, college, department, and society cannot logically or fairly be reduced to quantitative measures. Its criteria, then, are expressed as qualitative statements of standards of excellence against which individual effort is measured holistically.

Contributions to Teaching

"Teaching communicates knowledge to students and develops in them the desire and skills necessary to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarship. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction, but also advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students." [From UGA, *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* (Fall 2007), p. 14.]

The department holds that good teaching cannot be encapsulated solely in course evaluation numbers, in degrees of course innovation, or in raw numbers of advisees. The department believes that good teaching is manifested in a complex array of behaviors, dispositions, and indicators. These include but are not limited to:

- Courses whose design includes clear objectives, effective organization, and current content; course activities and assignments that are clearly related to the course goals and are useful in promoting learning; feedback that is useful and timely; evaluation that is based on clearly stated expectations.
- An instructor who is knowledgeable and well-prepared for each class meeting; who is receptive to student input and reflective about the pedagogy, monitoring student mastery of new skills and knowledge and adjusting instruction as appropriate; who challenges students to rise to their fullest potential as learners.
- Formal and informal student and peer evaluations that are positive.
- Non-classroom instructional duties commensurate with budgeted time, usually one-third of an instructional load. These duties include advising and mentoring students. Thus, the department expects faculty to carry a fair share of their program's advisees, independent study opportunities, thesis and dissertation committees and major advisor roles, *as appropriate to the specific needs of each program and with due regard to the faculty member's rank.* The quality of this sort of instruction is as important as quantity. Untenured assistant professors are expected to carry a lighter advisement and mentoring load than tenured and clinical faculty, as determined by program faculty.
- Instruction-related activities that expand departmental capacity and excellence, such as course revision, innovations in course content or delivery, and new course development. While such activities are encouraged, especially constant critical reflection on course content that might lead to course revision or innovation, there is no expectation that such activities result in new products on a regular basis.

	Teaching Performance
Did Not Meet Expectations	Frequently or consistently does not meet one or more of the criteria for good teaching listed. An occasional lapse, such as infrequent lower-than-average student evaluations of courses or a single semester of a low advisement load, would not qualify as frequent or consistent; trends across time can be considered to off-set outliers.
Met Expectations	Consistently achieves all of the criteria for good teaching, with due regard for trends in each criterion across time.
Exceeded Expectations	Demonstrates exemplary performance in some or most criteria for good teaching.

Contributions to Scholarship

"Inquiry and originality are central functions of the University. Faculty members are to discover new ideas, to fashion new interpretations of enduring ideas, and to participate in the application of these ideas. Consequently, faculty members should conduct research or engage in other creative activities appropriate to their disciplines and to the missions of their appointment units, and they should disseminate the results of their work through media appropriate to their disciplines. Interdisciplinary and collaborative works are valid forms of scholarly activity and will be judged as such as long as each candidate gives clear evidence of his/her participation in each instance. Faculty whose work assignments include research or other creative activities should clearly 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 principal standard should always be quality rather than quantity" [from UGA, *Guidelines…*, pp. 16-17.]

The department holds that contributions to scholarship cannot be adequately or justly measured by arbitrary numbers that equate one product of research with another or award one level of excellence to one form of dissemination and another level to a different form. The diversity among the faculty in areas of research, foundational disciplines, and methodological approaches is a significant strength of the department. It also results in a rich variety of scholarly work produced for particular constituencies that the faculty seeks to serve and influence. The department therefore values, and chooses to reward in its faculty evaluation policies and processes, multiple and varied ways of demonstrating scholarly excellence. In all cases, excellence within the selected approach and meaningful influence on a community of researchers or other practitioners are the ultimate criteria. Mindful of the university's assertion that "The principal standard [for judgments regarding scholarship] should always be quality rather than quantity," the department expects the following from the faculty:

- Faculty members will provide evidence of active, productive, and continually engaged scholarship proportionate to budgeted time.
- The body of scholarship developed by a faculty member will be coherent; that is, it should, for the most part, be directed toward a clear research question, or develop a clear line of research, though a researcher may, over a number of years, move from one question to another. A substantial portion of a faculty member's scholarship should provide evidence of the author's own conceptualizations and conclusions.
- The body of scholarship developed by a faculty member will create new knowledge and

advance the individual's discipline.

- The record of publication must be consistent, though it is explicitly understood that as researchers move from one area of research to another, there will be gaps in the record.
- Publications will be in venues (journals, publishers, websites, etc.) that are at least nationally regarded.
- As appropriate to individual faculty members' disciplines, programs, and research focus, grantsmanship will be encouraged and considered as a part of the overall contribution to scholarship, though failure to win grants will not, in and of itself, disqualify a faculty member from meeting or exceeding expectations.
- Acceptable modes of dissemination embrace multiple forms, including publication in books, book chapters, articles, book reviews, editorials, reports, and other forms of publication, either print or on-line; conference presentations, invited addresses, and other oral presentations; creative products, such as film, exhibitions, visual arts, and other artistic works, as appropriate to the discipline and the line of inquiry.
- Presentations are valuable for dissemination and to gain critical feedback, though the goal will be forms of publication that reach broader audiences.
- Peer-reviewed publication in selective journals is one important marker of scholarly stature and quality of research; however, because it is not always an infallible marker of impact, other measures of impact may be considered. These might include, among other things, invited contributions (addresses, chapters, collaborations, etc.); invitations to review or referee the scholarship of others; or dissemination of non-refereed scholarship that had a demonstrable impact, with evidence of that impact.
- The quality and quantity of scholarship will be comparable to that of peers at nationally-recognized institutions.

Because of the nature of research and dissemination, which may result in a very high rate of dissemination in one year and very low in another, the department will look at rates of scholarly productivity in running three-year increments.

	Research performance
Did Not Meet Expectations	Considering the year's productivity in the context of prior years, the research and dissemination record fails to meet some or many of the criteria for good research performance.
Met Expectations	Considering the year's productivity in the context of prior years, the research and dissemination record meets most or all of the criteria for good research performance.
Exceeded Expectations	Considering the year's productivity in the context of prior years, the research and dissemination record demonstrates exemplary research performance, defined as exceeding expectations in some or all of the criteria for good research performance.

Contributions to Service

"*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.

"*Service to the profession* includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; and review of grants applications" [from UGA, *Guidelines*…, pp. 18-19.]

The department expects all faculty members to be active in the governance of the department, college, and university, and to render their expertise and time to other communities – local, professional, or other. That service is different from the sort of service for which some faculty members are budgeted and that is defined contractually; it is service that is occasionally referred to as institutional citizenship; it is service without which the institution cannot survive. Justice and fairness dictate that these forms of service be expected of every member of the body. The criteria for service include:

- Participation in departmental affairs, including attending and contributing to department meetings, meeting committee assignments, responding in a timely manner to e-mail queries from the Department Head and colleagues, and in other ways contributing to the work of the department.
- Participation in college, university, and/or community (local, national, professional) organizations. This may include one or more of the following:
    - Contributing to the work of the college and university through service on college or university committees, boards, councils, work-groups, or other campus organizations;
    - Working with local organizations such as schools, local committees or boards, businesses, governmental agencies, or others;
    - Holding office or rendering other service to regional or national professional organizations (excluding paper presentations)
    - Other forms of service to groups beyond the department that calls upon instructional or scholarly expertise.

The service expectations for assistant professors are lower than for associate and full professors. Assistant professors are expected to be active in departmental affairs, but are not expected to take on substantial duties to the college, university or communities, particularly in their first two to three years. All others are expected to be actively involved in sustained service to the department and to other organizations.

	Service Performance
Did Not Meet Expectations	Fails to participate regularly and productively in departmental governance and/or fails to participate in the work of other college, university, or community organizations.
Met Expectations	Participates fully in departmental governance and renders service

	outside the department that draws on instructional or scholarly expertise.
Exceeded Expectations	Takes leadership in departmental and extra-departmental work and/or takes on a substantially high load of unbudgeted service activities

Procedures and deadlines:

Materials to be Submitted (February 1)

- Annual Faculty Activity Report (FAR or subsequent archival software) and curriculum vitae
  - FARs are public documents. Copies of all FARs will be made available to any faculty member upon request.
- Optional information:
  - Additional documentation demonstrating professional excellence
  - Selected artifacts referenced in the FAR or successor archival software
  - Goals and needs for future instruction, research, and service activities

Development of Faculty Activity Critiques

- The Department Head will draft a Faculty Activity Critique (FAC), an evaluative summary of each faculty member, with regard to teaching, research, and service, including suggestions for professional growth. In addition to a narrative summary, each area will be rated Did Not Meet Expectations, Met Expectations, or Exceeded Expectations.
- Each faculty member will have an opportunity to discuss the draft FAC with the Department Head. Changes may be made to the draft, if agreeable to both parties. The faculty member and Department Head must sign the final review; the faculty signature may not indicate full agreement, but does indicate that the faculty member read and discussed the FAC. The signed reviews must be returned to the Department Head before March 1.
- In case of a disagreement between the faculty member and the Department Head over the contents or language of the FAC, a faculty member may add an addendum to the FAC. Alternatively, a faculty member may appeal the FAC to the Dean of the College of Education.

Use of Annual Review for Salary Determination (completed by June 30)

Board of Regents and University of Georgia policies state that salary increases must be merit-based. The Department Head is required by institutional mandate to differentiate among faculty members for the purpose of assigning merit-based salary increases, even when several individuals are rated in the same category.

The Department Head will use the FAC and the FAR as the basis for recommendations for salary increases. Ordinarily, two methods will be combined to calculate salary increases, a percentage-based method and a dollar-based method. Each faculty member's salary increase is the sum of the dollar amount computed from each method.

- The percentage-based method assigns a specific percentage increase to each faculty member depending on the percentage increased authorized by the university. Those who do not meet expectations in a particular year will receive a lower percentage, or potentially no increase, compared to those who meet expectations; those who exceed expectations will re-

ceive a higher percentage increase. The percentage-based method rewards those making higher salaries more than those making lower salaries.

- The dollar-based method assigns a particular dollar amount to each of the three categories depending on the total dollars allocated to the department by the university. The dollar-based method rewards those making lower salaries, inasmuch as the fixed amount constitutes a higher percentage of the lower salary than of the higher salary.

Each faculty member eligible for a salary increase will realize half of the increase as a percentage increase and half as a dollar-amount increase, except in cases in which the administration mandates a particular method of determining merit increases.

…

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the Faculty within the Department and must be reviewed and approved by the Dean and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this document must be approved by the Faculty, Dean and the Provost.