



THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

*College of Education*

---

Educational Psychology

## Governance & Operating Procedures

February 2015; revised June 2015; revised May 2016

## Table of Contents

General Governance	3
Revisions	3
Quorum	3
Departmental Mission	3
Departmental Vision	3
Departmental Goals and Objectives	3-4
Department Head	5
Graduate Coordinator	5
Area of Emphasis Coordinators	5
Executive Committee	6
Faculty Senators	6
Faculty Retention Proposal	6
Salary Savings	6
Course Syllabi	6
Course Evaluations	6
Faculty Office Space Allocation	7
Visiting Scholar Request Procedure	7-8
Procedures for Appointments	8-9
Initial Advisement of Junior Faculty	9
Third Year Review Procedures	9
Annual Review Procedures	10-16
Promotion and Tenure Policies	17-28
Peer Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure and Promotion	29-30
Post-Tenure Review Procedures	31-32
Student Policies	33
Graduate Researchers in Educational Psychology (GREP) Student Association	33
Courses for Students on Assistantship	33
Doctoral Advisory Committee	33
Dismissal Policy for Graduate Students	33
Student Grievance Procedure	34-37
Grade Appeal Process	37-38
Graduate Student Funding	38-39
Student Space Allocation	39
Procedures for Annual Student Reporting	39

## **General Governance**

The policies contained herein have been developed over time with input from faculty, staff, and students. These policies and procedures are designed to support the mission, vision, values, and goals of the Department of Educational Psychology (EPSY). Although these policies reflect the departmentally agreed upon manner in which we conduct business, these policies might be superseded by the policies of the College of Education, The University of Georgia, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.

## **Revisions**

The policies and procedures contained within this manual may be revised and amended by the faculty when appropriate. All requests for revision will be considered at regularly scheduled faculty meeting when a quorum is present.

## **Quorum**

A quorum is the number of faculty required to conduct business. The primary venue for decisions related to faculty governance is the faculty meeting. Faculty meetings can be convened face-to-face or virtually. Preference is always for the face-to-face meetings. The quorum for EPSY faculty meetings is a simple majority of the full-time faculty in the department. Tenured, tenure-stream, or career-track faculty are considered faculty for the purpose of forming a quorum. (Approved: October 16, 2013; 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

## **Departmental Mission**

Our mission is to construct knowledge and provide worldwide intellectual leadership in the fields of teaching, learning, human development, or behavior. We prepare educational theorists, researchers, and practitioners as we work with others to enhance human development and education for diverse populations in local, state, national, and international contexts. (Approved: May 3, 2013; 16 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

## **Departmental Vision**

We envision ourselves as a community of scholars who facilitate the improvement of education, human development, and related policy to contribute to a well-educated, healthy, just, and equitable society. (Approved: May 3, 2013; 16 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

## **Departmental Goals and Objectives**

In October 2014, faculty convened to review the goals and objectives for our department. These goals and objectives reflect our common underpinnings of educational psychology and quantitative methodology while respecting the unique contributions of the individual areas of emphasis in the department.

### **Goal 1 (Research)**

*Improve theories, evidence-based models, and practices in educational psychology through research.*

Objective 1.1:           Generate innovative, research-based knowledge in learning, development, motivation, creativity, behavior, methodology, and mental health.

- Objective 1.2: Recruit and retain top scholars in each academic area of emphasis.
- Objective 1.3: Communicate research results and expert knowledge in a way that is useful to policymakers, educators, parents, and citizens in the state, the nation, and the world.
- Objective 1.4: Develop, conduct, and publish research in our areas of expertise that will significantly contribute to a well-educated, healthy, just, and equitable society.
- Objective 1.5: Establish programs of funding-eligible scholarly research and seek funding.

## **Goal 2 (Teaching)**

***Deliver effective instruction and mentorship to students and professionals to develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in research and evidenced-based educational and psychological practices.***

- Objective 2.1: Offer excellent, practical, research-based graduate and certification programs to professionals in the disciplines associated with educational psychology.
- Objective 2.2: Prepare students to produce research and scholarly inquiry to generate new knowledge, methodology, and solutions to problems.
- Objective 2.3: Prepare students to assume leadership roles in local, state, national and international institutions of higher education, government, and research and development centers.
- Objective 2.4: Employ innovative instructional techniques to reach broad student audiences from different contexts and meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds.
- Objective 2.5: Prepare professionals to apply knowledge that supports learning and performance across a variety of contexts and work environments.

## **Goal 3 (Service)**

***Support the growth of educational and scholarly communities through service.***

- Objective 3.1: Participate in mentoring activities that support junior faculty.
- Objective 3.2: Support the work of colleagues in the college and university through instruction, collaborative research, and consultation.
- Objective 3.3: Serve on area of emphasis, departmental, college, and university committees.
- Objective 3.4: Serve local, state, national, and international organizations through leadership roles, provision of expertise, and review activities.
- Objective 3.5: Prepare professionals to work in interdisciplinary settings that bring together new developments in knowledge, effective learning, and organizational systems.

(Approved: October 24, 2014; 13 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

### **Department Head**

The authority and duties of the department head are consistent with the statutes of The University of Georgia which stipulate “The Head of a department shall be recommended for appointment in accordance with Regent’s Policy. The Head shall be recommended for appointment after the Dean of a school or college has consulted with the faculty of the department. Such consultation shall include a vote of the faculty of the department, the results of which shall be forwarded with the Dean’s recommendation. A Department Head shall hold office at the pleasure of the President.” The specific duties of the Department Head are outlined in that policy and are not replicated here. (University of Georgia Statutes, Article IX, Section 5).

### **Graduate Coordinator**

The Dean of the Graduate School appoints the departmental Graduate Coordinator upon recommendation and approval by the department head and the academic dean of that unit. The Graduate Coordinator is an appointed member of the Graduate Faculty who serves as a liaison between the department and the Graduate School with delegated authority of the department head. It is the responsibility of the Graduate Coordinator to implement all policies and procedures of the Graduate Council pertaining to graduate education at The University of Georgia. Furthermore, the Graduate Coordinator works in conjunction with the Graduate Faculty in the department to ensure that policies and procedures unique to the department are followed. The specific duties of the Graduate Coordinator are outlined in the Graduate School’s Graduate Coordinator Handbook and are not replicated here. (University of Georgia Graduate Coordinator’s Handbook, Revised March 2009).

### **Area of Emphasis Coordinators**

The department will appoint Area of Emphasis (AoE) Coordinators based on the advice of the program faculty. The workload associated with being an AoE Coordinator is considered as time budgeted to service in lieu of instruction, except in exceptional cases as negotiated with the department head. The Department of Educational Psychology consists of four areas of emphasis:

- (1) Applied Cognition and Development
- (2) Gifted and Creative Education
- (3) Quantitative Methodology
- (4) School Psychology

While there may be task specific to EPSY areas of emphasis, the roles and responsibilities for these coordination positions consistent of:

- (1) collaborating with the Department head on matters related to budget and personnel.
- (2) collaborating with the Graduate Coordinator on matters related to Graduate School policy.
- (3) service on the EPSY Executive Committee.
- (4) implementing AoE goals, policies, and procedures.
- (5) convening AoE faculty meetings.
- (6) coordinating admissions processes for the AoE.
- (7) providing information for the department’s web pages to the department’s web liaison.
- (8) coordinating with office staff to provide course scheduling information.

### **Executive Committee**

The purpose of the Executive Committee for the department is to advise the Department Head on matters related to the administration of the department. The Executive Committee is comprised of the Department Head, Graduate Coordinator, Area of Emphasis Coordinators, and Faculty Senators (ad hoc). Other services provided by the Executive Committee include, but are not limited to, recommending departmental policies and procedures, previewing matters before review by the general EPSY faculty, and providing group representation of the department where appropriate. (Approved: October 16, 2013; 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

### **Faculty Senators**

The College of Education is governed, in part, by a college-wide Faculty Senate. Each department has two representatives on that governing body. These individuals typically serve two year terms and are elected by the department for such terms during a regularly scheduled departmental meeting.

### **Faculty Retention Proposal**

In the event that a faculty member is presenting a case for retention at The University of Georgia when having an outside offer in hand, the faculty in Educational Psychology will conduct a vote on whether the department supports the candidate's retention request. This vote will be used in the case presented to the Dean's office by the department head. (Approved; October 16, 2013, 10 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions).

### **Salary Savings**

The department's formal policy for allocation of salary savings is as follows: If a faculty member is bought out of instruction or research, 20% of that fund goes to the college and 80% is left to the department. After the college removes its portion (20%) from the salary savings return, once instruction is replaced either through the hire of a part-time faculty member or a graduate assistant, 20% of the remaining funds would go to the department to support departmental needs and pay for the costs associated with managing the accounting of the funds. The remaining dollars would go to the principal investigator for his or her use to support additional grant needs or for other professional needs. At any time, the department or the principal investigator can approach one another and renegotiate this arrangement if either party sees an increased need for resources. (Approved: October 19, 2012, 11 yes; 0 no; 0-abstentions).

### **Course Syllabi**

University Council policy requires a syllabus for each course. The full policy regarding syllabus content may be found at <http://www.curriculumssystemsga.edu/Policies/CourseSyllabusPolicy.pdf>. Faculty members are expected to upload individual syllabi each term they teach. The syllabus system can be found at [www.syllabus.uga.edu](http://www.syllabus.uga.edu).

### **Course Evaluations**

Faculty should follow the guidelines provided by the College of Education each semester. Faculty members are required to request evaluations from students in the core courses they teach. It is not necessary to collect evaluation data from students for independent study, thesis, or dissertation courses.

### **Faculty Office Space Allocation**

The following list ranks workspace allocation priority for EPSY faculty. Only open office spaces are addressed by this policy. Office allocations are subject to space availability and are assigned at the discretion of the department head.

1. Department Head
2. Graduate Coordinator
3. Professor
4. Associate Professor
5. Assistant Professor
6. Instructor
7. Lecturer
8. Academic Professional
9. Emeritus faculty
10. Temporary full-time appointments
11. Part-time appointments

### **Visiting Scholar Request Procedure**

The faculty welcomes visiting scholars to the department. To facilitate the smooth transition of such individuals to the department, faculty should follow the procedures below.

1. Faculty members receive a request from a visiting scholar to travel to UGA for an established period of time.
2. Faculty must verify scholars have their own financial support and provide proof of funding. A minimum of \$1500/month for a visitor alone, please \$400/month for spouse and \$300/month per child.
3. Faculty should refrain from extending invitations before approval by the Department Head.
4. Faculty should email the Department Head with a request to sponsor the scholar with a carbon copy to the Office Manager.
5. The department is required to pay a mandatory fee of \$165 to the Office of International Education.
6. The department/university does not incur any additional charges or provide any other financial support.
7. Scholars often obtain support from their home institutions, governments, or visit at their own expense.
8. Examples of how the department and university contribute to the scholar include access to the university library system, allowance to attend courses or seminars offered by faculty, and informal, personal consultation with faculty.
9. The department will attempt to provide office space and computer access; although this is not guaranteed.
10. The faculty member receives approval from the Department Head/Office Manager.
11. The faculty member extends a formal written invitation to sponsor the visiting scholar and provides evidence of that correspondence to the Office Manager to initiate the DS-2019 process.

12. The Office Manager contacts the visiting scholar for information needed to complete the DS-2019 which included a Curriculum Vitae (in English), proof of funding and health insurance, a copy of the biographical page of the passport (including spouse and children, if also visiting), the DS-2019 application information sheet, and the applicant's social security number or Canadian ID#, if the visitor has one.
13. The Office of International Education receives and processed the DS-2019 (within 15 business days).
14. The department receives the DS-2019 and mails with a tracking number to the visiting scholar.
15. The scholar pays the SEVIS fee to Homeland Security and takes the DS-2019 to the US Consulate in their country to obtain a J-1 Visa (a visa can take up to 6 months to obtain depending on the country from which they are traveling). Faculty should keep this in mind when they are coordinating the dates of the visit.
16. Once the scholar arrives, the individual checks in with the faculty sponsor and department, and with the Office of International Education within 3 days of the start date listed on Form DS-2019. The Office of International Education must validate the scholar's arrival information within SEVIS. Failure to check in with the Office of International Education will jeopardize the scholar's legal status in the United States.
17. The scholar receives a form from the department's Office Manager to obtain a UGA ID, the path to create a visitor MyID, and the form to request a library card. The scholar must complete the onboarding process within 3 days of arrival.

Visiting scholars are expected to locate and pay for their own housing; however, the faculty sponsor may assist in making local contacts. The Department of University Housing has a limited number of vacant staff apartments available for use by visiting scholars and guests of the University of Georgia. The scholar needs a UGA department to sponsor him/her for this type of housing and must have a sponsorship form signed by the Department Head.

### **Procedures for Appointments**

Plans for future hires including rationales for these hires are often based on a College of Education five-year or strategic plan. Each year a vote is taken at a faculty meeting to determine which faculty positions the department will seek in the next academic year. The department head will report the vote of the faculty to the Dean in writing. After the position descriptions are written, the Department Head submits a proposal to the Dean.

When a search is approved, a faculty Search Committee will be formed with all three ranks represented, when possible, and representation from the department. The Search Committee will select up to three people to interview, and more than three people when circumstances permit; and make their recommendation to the Department. Each interviewee will meet with the following people:

1. Department Head
2. Faculty and students
3. Dean or Associate Dean
4. Other selected College or University personnel

The Search Committee will lead a review discussion of all interviewees at a Department faculty meeting. A vote will be taken and forwarded along to the Dean with the Department Head's recommendation. Such votes may include a recommendation for tenure or placement on the graduate faculty.

### **Initial Advisement of Junior Faculty**

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 Procedures**

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 2 or 3 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 Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) Head detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. This dossier should take the form of Sections 4 and 5 of the promotion and tenure dossier. The head of the PTU will appoint a faculty committee, in accordance with the appointment unit bylaws, to provide a thorough review of the individual's dossier. This committee will contain no fewer than three eligible faculty members. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure at the University of Georgia. The third-year review committee will report its findings to the PTU, and the eligible faculty, including the PTU Head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. The committee will then report its recommendations, along with the vote, to the PTU head. The PTU head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU head/s letter, and any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed. (Approved: March 21, 2014; 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions)

**Annual Review Procedures** (Approved January 24, 2014; 12 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions)

Educational Psychology (EPSY) evaluates its faculty annually in the areas of **Teaching and Mentorship, Research, Service, and Administration** (as applicable). The following criteria are applied in each area: Fails to Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations. Several examples are provided in each of the areas in the Peer Assessment Rubric; 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 full professors, academic professionals, etc.). 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, course preparation, and grant submissions.

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

In 2012-2013, a fourth category of evaluation, **Administration**, will be applied for faculty in the department who have assumed the following administrative roles: program coordinator, graduate coordinator, department head, and clinic director). For faculty who are center directors, that portion of their administrative time will be evaluated by the appropriate person in the Dean's office. The administrative category will only apply to administrative duties associated with the Department of Educational Psychology.

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



	<p>addressed by the department head, if applicable. Candidate will be notified prior to completion of evaluation.</p> <p>Concerns with overall poor ratings on the standard course evaluations completed by students.</p>	<p>for the first time</p> <p>Address diversity issues in course delivery</p>	<p>Innovative course development or delivery</p> <p>Time intensive course delivery (e.g., providing service learning experiences)</p> <p>Programmatic redesign or restructuring, new certificates/degrees</p> <p>Award of teaching grants (e.g., Teacher Quality Grant)</p>
	<b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>
<p><b>Teaching: Graduate Student Mentorship*</b> (<i>Evidence of research and professional mentorship is differentiated according to program and student level</i>) Note that an explanation for some of these exemplars should be found in the faculty member's narrative. (Exemplars Listed Below for Each Rating, note: not all are required, nor does the presence of one automatically constitute rating the performance at that level)</p>			
	<p>Advising problems (information solicited from the program coordinators by the department head)</p>	<p><u>*For MA and professional student advising:</u></p> <p>Student attendance at conferences</p> <p><u>*For doctoral advising:</u></p> <p>Some evidence of co-authorship with students (submissions and</p>	<p>Evidence of extensive research and professional mentorship activities, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-authored submissions and published manuscripts, chapters, and monographs (indicate work with students on CV or in narrative)</li> <li>• Co-authored</li> </ul>

		publications) and conference presentations  Students make timely progress through program  <i>*For M.Ed. and Ed.S. Advising</i>  Meets routinely with students  Students programs indicate timely degree completion  Enhances the knowledge, skills, and dispositions around issues of diversity	conference presentations  Supervision of additional student work in centers and programs as well as services on doctoral committees  Evidence of outside consultation with graduate students (e.g., statistical consulting)  Work with honors or other undergraduate students
--	--	---	---

**(Completed by Review Committee) For Research, this profile does \_\_\_\_ or does not \_\_\_\_ reflect minimum standards for budgeted time. . \_\_\_\_ Not budgeted for research.**

### Research

In evaluating research, the faculty committee will consider the level of faculty contribution, quality, and impact. Research includes publications, research presentations, and grants. **The relative importance of chapters, books, and articles varies by discipline and should be specified in the personal statement.** The personal statement will be used to evaluate quality and impact of research contributions. In addition, EPSY recognizes that grants are not required to conduct high quality research. As a Department, however, we acknowledge the time required to prepare and submit proposals. The credit given for proposal submission will vary depending on the relevance to their research program, outlet, and funding sources. The elements in the table represent examples of research. As applicable, the faculty member’s research addresses issues of diversity.

	Fails to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Note that an explanation for some of these exemplars should be found in the faculty member’s narrative. (Exemplars			

Listed Below for Each Rating, note: not all are required, nor does the presence of one automatically constitute rating the performance at that level)			
<b>Publications</b>	Minimal work in progress or submitted	Active submissions (scholarly products under review, in press, and/or published)	Exceptional publications in terms of impact, number, outlet quality, etc.
<b>Presentations</b>	No presentations	At least one national or international research presentation	Extensive presentations  Invited Scholarly Talk
<b>Grants</b>	No grant activity	Quality active proposal submissions  Participation or consultation on collaborative grants	Receipt of new research grant  Continued working on existing research grant  Assistantship support for students on funded grants (indicate in written narrative)

***(Completed by Review Committee)* For Service, this profile does \_\_\_\_ or does not \_\_\_\_ reflect minimum standards for budgeted time. \_\_\_\_ Not budgeted for service.**

### Service

EPSY recognizes three categories of service: professional service, community service, and service to the Program, Department, College, or University (hereafter referred to as UGA

service). **Professional service** includes: Editorial boards, grant reviews, advisory boards, conference proposal reviews, ad hoc reviews, panels (e.g., NSF), professional committees (e.g., APA, NCME, NAGC), external review letters, and delivery of workshops/in-service presentations to professional groups. **Community service** is *professionally-related* volunteer work and work with state or local non-profits, schools, and agencies. **UGA service** includes student committees, program committees (e.g., appeals), departmental committees, clinic service, First-Year Odyssey teaching, accreditation reporting, faculty senate (and faculty senate committees), college committees, and university committees. The elements in the table represent examples of service. As applicable, the faculty member’s service addresses issues of diversity.

	Fails to Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Note that an explanation for some of these exemplars should be found in the faculty member’s narrative. (Exemplars Listed Below for Each Rating, note: not all are required, nor does the presence of one automatically constitute rating the performance at that level)			
Professional service	No evidence	Some evidence of professional service (e.g., scholarly manuscript reviews)  Applied Research Grants (if part of work load; e.g., contract or technical reports)	Extensive evidence of services (e.g., applied research grants (e.g., school evaluations), appointment to national panels, number of reviews, journal editorship)
Department, College, University service	No evidence	Some evidence of department, college and university service (e.g., membership on at least one committee)	Extensive evidence of department, college, and university service (e.g., search committees outside of department, participation in human subjects reviews)

Community service ( <i>desired but not expected</i> )	No evidence	Some evidence of community service (e.g., assistance with grant submission, member of advisory board)	Extensive evidence (e.g., leadership position in non- profit, participating on public school advisory committees)
--	-------------	---	---

### **Administrative Tasks (if applicable)**

The Department of Educational Psychology recognizes the administrative roles as necessary functions of department life. For the purposes of this assessment, administration will be considered program coordination (e.g., ACD, GCE, QM, SPY), graduate coordinator, department head, and SPY clinic director. Some additional form mechanisms exist for evaluation of these positions (e.g., College evaluation of Department Heads). Factors in evaluation include meeting defined job expectations, efficiency, communication, and responsiveness to faculty, staff, and students.

Satisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

Unsatisfactory \_\_\_\_\_

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

Revised April 2015

Effective September 1, 2015

**Introduction**

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

**Voting Eligibility**

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

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

**Appointment**

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

The Department values mentoring and support of junior faculty. We believe that junior faculty represent an investment of substantial human and financial resources, and retention and promotion of contributing faculty benefits the entire department. This philosophy supports a formalized mentoring structure designed to provide as much assistance as possible toward

promotion. The Department Head will assist the faculty member in choosing a **Mentoring Committee**, composed of at least three individuals, to each junior faculty member in the first year of employment. The purpose of the Mentoring Committee will be to meet at least one time each semester with the faculty member being mentored to review progress and recommend activities for progress toward promotion and tenure. The Mentoring Committee should consist of at least three people, with at least two from the Department of Educational Psychology. During the second year, the junior faculty member can revise the mentoring committee, as she or he and the department head deem appropriate. Any mentor assignment may change upon agreement among faculty member, mentor, and Head. The mentor(s) and the Department Head will serve as a team to provide advice in professional matters, particularly preparation for promotion and tenure. A chair of the mentoring committee (generally from the candidate's area of emphasis) will be selected and facilitate called meetings.

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

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

### **Preliminary Consideration for Promotion and Tenure**

The Department of Educational Psychology will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the University Guidelines. Although it is preferred that a faculty member submit a written request to the Department Head for promotion and/or tenure considerations in their

fourth year of rank, an assistant professor may also choose to be considered for promotion and tenure by the 1st of September during their 5th year of rank. Associate professors pursuing promotion to professor may request consideration when he or she has determined professional readiness. A faculty member who is a candidate for promotion and/or tenure also should work closely with her or his Mentoring Committee and the Department Head in preparing the dossier.

## **Annual Review**

Educational Psychology evaluates its faculty annually in the areas of **Teaching and Mentorship, Research, and Service**. The following criteria are applied in each area: Fails to Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations. Several examples are provided in each of the areas in the Peer Assessment Rubric (see departmental example in the departmental procedures handbook; these are examples only and are not meant to represent every product or activity that may result in a particular rating. In addition, the faculty will also consider level and position in their evaluation (expectations vary for assistant, associate, and professors). In particular, assistant professors should not be overly committed to activities that hamper their progress in establishing a research program – this principle may be applied in evaluation of their student committee and service work and course preparation.

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

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

### **Formal Review for Promotion and/or Tenure**

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

### **Department Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of Educational Psychology and must be reviewed and approved by the Dean of the College of Education and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and the University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, Dean of the College of Education, and Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document. This iteration of the document was approved on April 24, 2015 with a vote of 16 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstentions.

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

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

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

### **I. Contributions to Teaching**

The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarship. Teaching includes formal classroom instruction, advising, and mentoring of undergraduate students, graduate students, and colleagues within and outside of the University. Faculty are expected to teach at a level that reflects their breadth and depth of scholarship and demonstrates evidence of an emerging stature (for those pursuing the rank of Associate Professor) or national or international recognition (for those pursuing the rank of Professor). Effectiveness for teaching is found in the candidate's performance and "reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum (p. 14, University Guidelines)." The Department of Educational Psychology operationalized this clear and convincing effectiveness with primary and secondary evidence as noted below. Contained within some of the evidence markers below are scales of performance which document the candidate attained either emerging national stature or national or international recognition to move to the next rank. These evidence markers are delineated by rank.

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

#### **Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Teaching**

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

expertise related to teaching. Faculty seeking promotion from associate to full should show *sustained commitment to teaching excellence* since the previous promotion.

### **1. Teaching Effectiveness**

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

### **2. Student Supervision**

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

### **3. Maintenance of relevant licensures and certifications**

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

### **B. Additional Evidence for Teaching**

#### 1. Teaching Effectiveness

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

#### 2. Teaching Accomplishments

- Honors and recognitions received for teaching
- Grants related to instruction

- Election to offices, committee activities as related to teaching
- Innovative instructional practices

### 3. Instructional Development

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

### 4. Student Supervision

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

### 5. Scholarship Related to Teaching

- Publication activities directly related to college teaching

## II. Contributions to Research

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

Faculty whose budgeted time includes research must demonstrate high quality in these endeavors. The University distinguishes between the routine and the outstanding as judged by the candidate's peers at the University of Georgia and elsewhere. The standard should always be quality rather than quantity, at all levels, but faculty seeking to be promoted to professor are expected to be recognized as among the leaders of their fields.

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

### A. Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Research

## 1. Publications

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

## 2. Leadership in Research

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

## 3. Presentations

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

## 4. Grants/Contracts

- Assistant→Associate: emerging grantsmanship, as required in the letter of offer, targeting internal or extramural sources; this work might include grants submitted but not received;
- Associate→Full: Success in obtaining extramural funding to support research should be evident, at least some of which demonstrates scholarly independence from senior collaborators. This does not exclude team collaborations in which the Associate has demonstrated a significant scholarly contribution. The candidate can exempt this requirement with a *scholarship-driven book* (see above).

## **B. Additional Evidence for Research**

### 1. Non-refereed Publications

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

### 2. Leadership in Research

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

### 3. Workshops or Other Scholarly Talks

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

### 4. Other Contributions to Grants and Contracts

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

### 5. Editorial Roles

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

### 6. Product Development

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

### 7. Theory into Practice

- Application of research scholarship in the field.

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

#### 8. Student Supervision of Research

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

### III. Contributions to Service to Society, Outreach and Engagement

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

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

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

#### A. Primary Discipline-Specific Evidence for Service

##### 1. Program and Department Committees and Governance

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

## **2. College and University Committees and Governance**

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

## **B. Additional Evidence for Service**

### **1. Program and Department**

- Supporting or mentoring colleagues in teaching, research, and/or service
- Other committee work

### **2. College and University**

- Contracts, grants and gifts received or earned related to service activities.
- Consultation and technical assistance.

### **3. National, International, and Professional Organization Roles**

- Copyrights, patents and inventions related to service activities.
- Selection for special service activities outside the state or nation.
- Requests by individuals from outside the state or nation to study the candidate's work and innovations.
- Governance bodies and related activities.
- Service on grant review panels.
- Leadership service for professional organizations indicating a reputation at the national and international levels

### **4. State and Regional Roles**

- Consultation, outreach, and technical assistance.
- Performance of clinical activities.
- Governance bodies and related activities.
- Awards for Service

### **5. Local Schools and Community Organizations Roles**

- Service-based instructional activities.
- Service products.
- Governance bodies, partnerships, and related activities.

## Tenure

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

Peer Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure and Promotion\*  
Approved October 23, 2015

Documents to be evaluated

**1. Course Syllabus**

- a. Alignment of content of syllabi for all courses taught by the instructor with objectives of the course
  - b. Clear information on grading and assessment
2. **Course materials**- instructor provides materials used in the course (e.g., sample reading assignments, sample Powerpoint)
3. **Overview of Course**- an explanation of the course goals, the methods and materials for reaching the goals, and how the evaluations assess whether the goal has been met.

Interviews and observations

1. **Classroom observation** will occur for faculty seeking tenure or promotion and on request for faculty at other points in their career. Classroom observations will be done in one of two ways as decided by the instructor: videotaping of the class or in-person observation. Classroom observations will be done by two faculty members, one member will be from the faculty member's emphasis area and one person from the tenure and promotion committee.
- a. The rubric for the classroom observations includes
    - i. An overview of the course is provided to students.
    - ii. The course goals are clear.
      1. Is instruction in line with the course goals?
    - iii. The types of assessments used measure the course goals and are appropriately administered.
    - iv. The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the learning goals.
      1. Is the class organized and is there a logical sequence to the class?
      2. Is there clarity in the presentation of the materials and the instructor's presentation?
      3. Is the instructor up-to-date on the latest research?
      4. Does the instructor appear to be prepared for the class?
    - v. The learning activities and learner interactions promote the achievement of the stated course goals.
      1. Is the instructor responsive to students?
      2. Is the content and instruction appropriate for the level of the course?
    - vi. The course is accessible to all students regardless as to any disability.
  - b. On-line course evaluations will involve the committee members being added to the course as instructors. This will allow them access to taped conversations, discussions and assignments. The rubric listed below will be used.
    - i. An overview of the course is provided to students.
    - ii. The course goals are clear.
      1. Is instruction in line with the course goals?
    - iii. The types of assessments used measure the course goals and are appropriately administered.

- iv. The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the learning goals.
    - 1. Is the class organized and is there a logical sequence to the class?
    - 2. Is there clarity in the presentation of the materials and the instructor's presentation?
    - 3. Is the instructor up-to-date on the latest research?
    - 4. Does the instructor appear to be prepared for the class?
  - v. The learning activities and learner interactions promote the achievement of the stated course goals.
    - 1. Is the instructor responsive to students?
    - 2. Is the content and instruction appropriate for the level of the course?
  - vi. Course tools and media support the course goals.
  - vii. Technical support is provided to students.
  - viii. The course is accessible to all students regardless as to any disability.
2. **Interviews of students** of the observed class will occur in the middle of the semester and will take place during the last 20 minutes of a regular class period.
- a. The students will be asked about their perceptions of the course and recommendations for improvement. The rubric for classroom observations will be used to prompt student comments.
  - b. In addition to verbal comments students will all be given a blank piece of paper and asked to write comments if they do not feel comfortable sharing their opinion aloud. There will be no Likert rating scale.
  - c. Regarding online courses, given that many online students do not fill out evaluations these courses are more difficult to evaluate. There are two options.
    - i. Provide an incentive for students to complete the online course evaluation.
    - ii. Call a random sample (5) of students from the courses to be evaluated and interview them over the phone, using Blackboard collaborate, or via Skype.
3. **Meeting with instructor.** The peer review committee will meet twice with the instructor. Once, at the beginning of the semester to discuss the instructor's overview of the course and other aspects of instruction that the instructor believes are important for the team to know. A second meeting will be at the end of the semester or year at which time the team will provide the instructor with the results of their findings including formative information.

#### Frequency of teaching evaluations

The schedule for peer evaluations is designed to focus more on faculty seeking promotion and faculty new to the University of Georgia. More senior, tenured faculty will be assessed on request. All pre-promotion instructors will be evaluated on one course per year. The instructor selects the courses to be evaluated with the condition that at least two different courses must be evaluated before promotion and of those courses one must be evaluated twice.

\*evaluation of temporary instructors will be done differently given the limited time that these individuals teach.

### **Post-Tenure Review Procedures**

The Department of Educational Psychology's written criteria and procedures for post-tenure review are consistent with the guidelines from The University of Georgia's Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty (<http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies-procedures/appt-promotion-tenure/policy-for-review-of-tenured-faculty/>). Unless stipulated below, the department will employ the university's procedures for the post-tenure review process including its appeals process.

*Procedures* (Approved May 3, 2013; 17 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention)

(1) A review will be conducted every five years consistent with the university policy on routine review of faculty.

(2) The candidate undergoing post-tenure review will receive the required notification letter announcing that he or she will undergo review in the next academic year. This notification will be consistent with the College of Education's dates for notifying faculty about upcoming post tenure review processes. The candidate will be asked to inform the unit head about any potential review members from outside of the department whom the candidate would like to have considered. Once the candidate has informed the unit head about outside membership, a list of 10 tenured members from the department/external members will be generated and sent to the individual undergoing post-tenure review. The candidate has the right to strike up to five names from the list. A committee of three will be randomly selected from the remaining names. This process is consistent with the "lottery" option specified in the university policy. One member of that committee will be appointed the chair.

(3) The candidate will provide the committee with a comprehensive vita, documentation of budgeted time and annual reviews for the five years preceding the review, and a concise statement summary of accomplishments and future plans not to exceed two pages in length. Additionally, discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the promotion/tenure unit and the University, is allowed if either the Post-Tenure Review Committee or faculty member so desire. The review may also consist of a faculty member's contributions to interdisciplinary programs, governance, administration, and other programs outside the promotion/tenure unit.

(4) A concise, written summary of the review and a conclusion as to whether his/her performance is deemed satisfactory will be provided to the faculty member. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the promotion/tenure unit head and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. If the faculty member's performance is deemed not satisfactory, the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall provide a report identifying areas of weakness and suggest actions that might strengthen the faculty member's performance.

(5) The promotion/tenure unit head shall also maintain in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.

(6) A faculty member may request reconsideration of the post-tenure review recommendation of the Post-Tenure Review Committee by submitting a letter and additional documentation to the

promotion/tenure unit head within 15 days of receipt of the written review. The committee will consider this additional information and uphold or modify their review recommendation.

(7) In the event that the candidate wishes to pursue the appeal outside of the department, a faculty member may appeal in writing to the university Post-Tenure Review Committee. Materials must be submitted within 15 days of the decision rendered by the departmental committee. The appeal will go to the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee of the University Council.

(8) If a faculty member's performance is deemed not satisfactory in the review, once all requests for reconsideration and appeals have been exhausted, the promotion/tenure unit head, the faculty member, the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, must establish a formal plan of faculty development. From this point forward, the department will employ the university procedure documented in the University's Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty.

## Student Policies

### **Graduate Researchers in Educational Psychology (GREP) Student Association**

The Graduate Researchers in Educational Psychology Student association is designed to foster contacts and communication between students and faculty in the Department of Educational Psychology and encourage active participation in projects related to the various fields represented in the department.

### **Courses for Students on Assistantship**

Students on assistantship are required to register for a minimum of 12 credits during the academic year and 9 credits during the summer term. If possible, students should register for three credits of either EPSY 7005 (Master's and Specialist students) or EPSY 9005 (Doctoral students) under the professor for whom they are either teaching or conducting research.

### **Doctoral Advisory Committee**

Doctoral committees must meet the University of Georgia's Graduate School guidelines for composition. Doctoral committees in EPSY must consist of a minimum of four members of whom three are members of the graduate faculty. In addition, one of the four members must be outside of the student's area of emphasis. If there are co-chairs, the minimum number of committee members required is still four. Decisions about doctoral committee composition are specific to areas of emphasis. While the department's general guidelines are listed above, students should consult specific requirements in their area of emphasis, which may be more stringent than the general departmental guidelines. (Approved: October 16, 2013, 14 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

### **Dismissal Policy for Graduate Students**

A student who exhibits a pattern of behaviors which are judged very likely to hinder the student's performance as a professional will also be reviewed for possible dismissal. The faculty will use, as guides, behaviors described in the professional standards that guide our four respective areas of scholarship. These guidelines include ethics and professional behaviors and dispositions codes from the American Psychological Association, the National Association for Gifted Children, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. Our professional standards also inform our programs in substantive areas. As such our students should also align their practice to the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA/APA/NCME). In rare circumstances, student behavior might be considered a serious enough breach of ethical, professional, or academic standards as to warrant immediate dismissal from the program.

*Applied Cognition and Development (Approved March 4, 2016)*

Students, not meeting the expectations for student performance or exhibiting conduct not befitting the ethical and professional standards (e.g., academic dishonesty), will be reviewed for possible dismissal from the ACD Area of Emphasis. Following a negative review, the ACD faculty has the option of putting the student on probation. If the Area of Emphasis puts the student on probation, the student will receive a letter indicating what must improve, a deadline

for improvement, and the consequences for failing to improve. It is the responsibility of the student to meet the deadline for improvement.

*Quantitative Methods (Approved Feb 22, 2016)*

Students, not making sufficient academic progress as assessed by the annual evaluation from the QM faculty or exhibiting conduct not befitting the ethical and professional standards (e.g., academic dishonesty), will be reviewed for possible dismissal from the QM program of study. Following a negative review, the QM faculty has the option of putting the student on probation. If the Area of Emphasis puts the student on probation, the student will receive a letter indicating what must improve, a deadline for improvement, and the consequences for failing to improve. It is the responsibility of the student to meet the deadline for improvement.

*Gifted and Creative Education (March 18, 2016)*

Students, not making sufficient academic progress as assessed by the timeline for completion for GCE or exhibiting conduct not befitting the ethical and professional standards (e.g., academic dishonesty), will be reviewed for possible dismissal from their program of study. Following a negative review, the GCE faculty has the option of putting the student on probation. If the AoE puts the student on probation, then the student will receive a letter indicating what must improve, a deadline for improvement and the consequences for failing to improve. It is the responsibility of the student to meet the deadline for improvement.

*School Psychology (May 9, 2016)*

Students, not making sufficient academic progress as assessed by the timeline for completion for SPY or exhibiting conduct not befitting the ethical and professional standards (e.g., academic dishonesty), will be reviewed for possible dismissal from their program of study. Following a negative review, the SPY faculty has the option of putting the student on probation. If the AoE puts the student on probation, then the student will receive a letter indicating what must improve, a deadline for improvement and the consequences for failing to improve. It is the responsibility of the student to meet the deadline for improvement. In accordance with standards set by the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychology, additional guidelines about student progress, probation, and dismissal are found in the student handbook.

**Student Grievance Procedure**

(Ratified September 30, 2010, Revised January 24, 2014; 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions)

**PURPOSE:** This policy has been developed to give students a fair, explicit, and protected process to grieve actions by faculty, staff or other students in the Department of Educational Psychology that they feel have resulted in unfair treatment or unfair disadvantage related to their learning or work here. Possible applications might include, but are not limited to: grade protests, protests regarding the conduct of comprehensive or written or oral examinations (including thesis

and dissertation defenses), complaints regarding the actions of an advisor or a supervisor, and complaints relating to Program or department policies which they regard as unfair. According to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), the institution is required to have “adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.”

The intent of this policy is to resolve grievances as quickly and fairly as possible and to protect the due process rights of both students and those against whom grievances may be filed. Grievances under this policy may be filed by an individual student or a group of students with a common grievance. Consistent with University guidelines and procedures, the following Grievance and Dispute policy outlines specific steps a student would move through to resolve a dispute. The Departmental policy mirrors that established by the University of Georgia (see <http://www.uga.edu/legal/pdfs/Dispute.pdf>). In addition to the Grievance and Dispute steps outlined below, additional resources exist on the University of Georgia campus for other specific areas of concern. The student has the right to access University resources at any time. (Details of these alternative University resources can be found at the end of this document).

**PRELIMINARY STEP:** Prior to filing an official grievance, the student(s) is encouraged to resolve the matter with the person or persons involved. An exception to this might be when the student(s) has a reasonable fear of adverse consequences or retaliation. If the matter cannot be resolved at this level, the student(s) **may choose** to seek mediation by contacting the Department Head who, in turn, will appoint a mediation coordinator within three business days. The Department Head may designate the Graduate Coordinator to serve as mediation coordinator, except in the event that the Graduate Coordinator is part of the complaint. As an alternative, a Full Professor in EPSY may be appointed to serve as the mediation coordinator. The mediation coordinator should be an independent, neutral, and informal resource for all parties concerned in the Grievance and/or Dispute.

The mediation coordinator will meet with the student, those cited in the Grievance or Dispute, and any other relevant parties (e.g., staff, students, faculty) in order to gather information about the expressed concern. The mediation coordinator will complete this inquiry within a period of 10 business days, except under exceptional circumstances. The mediation coordinator may seek to help the student resolve the dispute through various avenues, including scheduling a meeting between all concerned parties, working individually with the student and faculty member to identify and initiate a resolution, etc. If the Dispute or Grievance is not or cannot be resolved at this point, the mediation coordinator will inform both the Department Head and the student, in writing, about the lack of resolution. The student will be informed in writing of his or her rights and responsibilities in resolving or continuing the Grievance and Dispute.

At any stage of the Grievance and Dispute Procedure, the student may file a formal complaint or access another University Resource (e.g., Student Ombudsperson <http://www.uga.edu/ombudsperson/index.html>). For students who choose to proceed within the Department’s outlined procedure, the following steps should be followed:

**STEP 1:** A formal, signed grievance, including the complaint and the remedy sought, and accompanied by any relevant documentation, should be submitted in writing to the Department

Head within two calendar months of the offense (exceptions to this timeline may be made due to the intervention of a holiday, summer session or at the discretion of the Departmental Grievance Committee). *A copy of the written complaint shall be kept in a file in the Department.* If the Department Head is named as a party in the Grievance, the Graduate Coordinator or other Full Professor in the Department acceptable to all parties shall be assigned to address subsequent actions related to that grievance.

All parties named in the grievance shall receive a written, signed copy of the grievance and all accompanying documentation within one business week of its filing. At this time, those named in the grievance shall also have the opportunity to submit any relevant documentation; this documentation shall be submitted within three weeks.

The Department Head shall take all steps necessary to ensure that those filing grievances, as well as those against whom they are filed, are protected against possible reprisals during and subsequent to the appeals process.

**STEP 2:** The Department Head shall within 3 business days of receipt of the signed grievance send a copy of the grievance and all accompanying materials to the Chair of that Committee via both email and paper copy. The Departmental Grievance Committee shall be a standing committee with five members, appointed by the Department Head for a term of at least one academic year. The Graduate Coordinator should be an *Ex Officio* member of this committee. The Chair shall convene the Committee (minimum of three members present) within 10 business days of receiving the written grievance and accompanying materials from the Department Head. If any member of the standing committee is involved in the grievance or advisor, mentor, or close friend to or otherwise closely related to someone involved in the grievance, that member shall recuse him or herself, and a substitute member appointed by the Chair. Failure to so recuse in light of undue connection to a party involved in the grievance constitutes grounds for appeal by any party to the grievance.

At the hearing, each party shall have the right to speak with and/or submit additional documentation to the Committee. Both student and faculty may also choose to include “an advisor other than an attorney to assist and advise the complainant” (Office of Legal Affairs). In exceptional cases, an outside witness(es) may be brought in with the approval of the Committee chair.

The Committee’s decision shall be restricted to the following options:

- dismissal of the grievance as unfounded
- granting of the full redress requested in grievance
- granting of some, but not all, of the elements of redress requested in the grievance
- approving an alternative resolution agreed to by all parties in the presence of the Committee

All parties and the Department Head shall be notified of the Committee decision on the grievance in writing within seven business days of the hearing.

**STEP 3:** Upon receipt of the Committee's decision, any party involved may appeal said decision to the College Appeals Committee within 45 business days as outlined in the relevant College policy.

#### SOME ADDITIONAL UNIVERSITY RESOURCES:

*Equal Opportunity Office (<http://www.uga.edu/eoo/>)*

The Non-Discrimination/Anti-Harassment Officer (NDAH Officer) is the individual or individuals designated by the President to be primarily responsible for providing education and training about discrimination and harassment to the University community, and for investigating reports and complaints of discrimination and harassment in accordance with this policy. The Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, and/or his designee(s) currently serves as the NDAH Officer. The NDAH Officer(s) can be reached at the Equal Opportunity Office at (706) 542-7912.

*UGA Ombudspersons Program (<http://www.uga.edu/ombudsperson/ombudsperson.html>)*

Furthering its commitment to creating a positive learning environment, the University of Georgia recently named three ombudspersons to serve faculty, staff and students. The ombudspersons are designated individuals who serve as independent, neutral and informal resources for UGA students, faculty and staff. Rather than serving as advocates for individual members of the university community, these individuals are advocates for fairness, and they function as a source of information and referral. They assist, to the extent possible, in informally resolving concerns brought to their attention. They serve as third-party fact finders who remain neutral while looking into complaints or grievances, including those related to discrimination and harassment.

*Office of Legal Affairs (<http://www.uga.edu/legal/pdfs/Dispute.pdf>)*

Dispute Resolution Coordinators are located in the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Human Resources and are responsible for helping to coordinate the expeditious and fair resolution of problems raised by University students and employees.

*Disability Resource Center: A Division of Student Affairs (<http://www.dissvcs.uga.edu>)*

Should a student registered with the DRC feel he/she has not been treated in a fair or professional manner with regard to accommodations, the student can follow the procedures listed in the DRC's Policies and Procedures manual.

#### **Grade Appeal Process**

University of Georgia students have the right to appeal academic decisions. The appeal usually goes first to the unit responsible for the decision, for example, grade change requests go to the faculty members who assigned the grades; department requirements to the department; college requirements to the college; university requirements to the Educational Affairs Committee. An unfavorable ruling at one level can be appealed to the successive levels. The EPSY grade appeal process is:

1. Student discusses a request for change of grade with instructor within six weeks after the grade has been posted. [If the student is satisfied, no further action is required.]

2. Student may submit a written request to instructor for a grade change prior to the midpoint of the following semester (copied to major advisor). The student must receive an official reply from the instructor, based on the instructor's professional judgment, within two weeks of receiving the request for a grade change. [If the grade is changed, no further action is required.]
3. Student may submit a written appeal to the Area of Emphasis Coordinator (copied to the Department Head) prior to the end of the following semester. The Area of Emphasis Coordinator will convene a 3-member review panel comprised of the Area of Emphasis Coordinator, the Graduate Coordinator and a non-program faculty member within the department. The Area of Emphasis Coordinator will serve as the convener of the review panel. The student must receive an official reply within four weeks of receiving the student's written appeal to the lower decision. (This satisfies the departmental level responsibility for the grade appeal process.) If the grade is changed, no further action is required. (Approved November 15, 2013; 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions)

### **Graduate Student Funding**

The Department of Educational Psychology advocates for its applicants by presenting their credentials to the University of Georgia Graduate School for funding opportunities. For admitted students who receive a Graduate School Assistantship, funding is provided for the first 21 months of the student's program. After that time, students are to receive a match of funding from the nominating department. While these Graduate School Assistantships often make the difference in the department's ability to recruit the best and brightest students into our programs, the matching funding requirement also places a strain on departmental resources. Therefore, it is necessary to develop departmental guidelines for the distribution of assistantship dollars that are allotted to the department to not only support those to whom we are committed and who have received Graduate School funding but also to those excellent students whose credentials have not been submitted or for those students who were not awarded funding by the Graduate School. Students are encouraged to also pursue funding from sources outside of the department.

(1) Students who are awarded a Graduate School Assistantship will receive four semesters of funding once the Graduate School allotment is over. Departmental support includes teaching assistantships or any other faculty-supported funding during the two years immediately following the conclusion of graduate school funding. After that time, our departmental commitment to the student would be officially concluded; however, these students could still receive funding by working on a grant or other funded project at the discretion of the faculty member. In addition while these students would be welcome to apply for any funding that is advertised, they would receive low priority for funding within the department during any open call for departmental assistantships.

(2) Students who had not been previously supported through Graduate School funding could receive four semesters of departmental support. The department would prioritize doctoral students for such funding before master's and specialist students. Like their counterparts who have received Graduate School funding, while these students would be welcome to apply for any funding that is advertised, they would receive low priority for funding during any open call for departmentally supported assistantships. These students are always eligible for faculty supported funding (e.g., grants) and that funding is entirely at the discretion of the faculty member.

(3) Students who request support for out-of-state tuition waivers awarded by the Graduate School will be nominated in the following order: (a) students who are entering MA/PhD programs with no other sources of funding support; (b) M.Ed. and Ed.S. students who have not received any other funding support from the department; and (c) all other students not recognized in (a) or (b). The nomination of students who have received out-of-state tuition waivers would be limited to two years of support so that incoming students would also have the benefit of this waiver program.

(4) This policy does not cover students who are nominated and receive the Graduate School's Presidential Scholarship. (Approved September 20, 2013; 16 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions).

### **Student Space Allocation**

The department values our student colleagues and to the extent possible, will work to obtain space for their research, teaching, and study needs. The priority for physical space is as follows:

1. Graduate Teaching Assistant (State Funded)
2. Graduate Teaching Assistant (Non-state Funded)
3. Graduate Research Assistant
4. Graduate Assistant (State Funded)
5. Graduate Assistant (Non-state Funded)
6. Non-assistantship Doctoral Student
7. Non-assistantship Masters Student

All space assignments are subject to availability. Priority is given to students without space provided by an academic advisor or a work supervisor. Students are expected to share spaces with other students and all students are encouraged to use the Graduate Student Commons on the third floor.

### **Procedures for Annual Student Reporting**

The department annually collects information to assist with our student outcomes reporting. This information is also used for our program review with the university. For annual reporting, the department will summarize the overall ratings of satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress, in addition to whether or not the student is being placed on probation or being dismissed. For all MA/PhD students, please require students to turn in an updated curriculum vitae as part of required materials. After the faculty composes the annual evaluation letter and are ready to give the assistant to the Graduate Coordinator a copy to file, please also include a copy of the student's curriculum vitae. The department will use these data to pull information for students such as publications and presentations for reporting purposes. All letters and curriculum vitae are due to the Assistant to the Graduate Coordinator by June 1.