



## GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF RESEARCH SCIENTISTS

Effective 8-1-2023

### 1. Background & Definitions

#### 1.1 Definition of Research Scientists

The Research Scientist faculty track includes the ranks of Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, and Senior Research Scientist. All of these positions are non-tenurable faculty positions involved in some aspect of research, research-related instruction, research service, and/or research administration.

Occupants of these positions have obtained the terminal degree of the discipline (or equivalent), and most often have postdoctoral research experience prior to appointment. These guidelines apply equally to part-time and full-time Research Scientists.

The Research Scientist faculty positions must be distinguished from Research Professionals, the latter title being used to classify staff positions (grades I – IV, the last including PhD-level employees).

#### 1.2 Research Scientist Internal Titles

Research Scientist is the official title used by Human Resources to classify these faculty positions. However, some units choose more specific titles for internal use. For example, Research Chemist, Research Biologist, Research Geologist, etc., are all informal titles that may be used for internal reference only.

#### 1.3 Roles of Research Scientists

Research Scientists engage in scholarly and creative research appropriate to their field of specialization and to the mission(s) of their particular unit. They are expected to investigate new ideas, to reinterpret established ideas, and to disseminate results of their research through media appropriate to their discipline. These individuals have potential to establish a research program and obtain independent research grants and contracts as principal investigators. They may also be involved with instructional, service, and administrative roles related to research and may apply for Graduate Faculty status to allow them to serve on graduate committees and direct graduate students and postdoctoral scholars. Research Scientists' engagement with students in and out of the classroom may include involvement with Student Success Activities, as defined in University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Manual 1.10-10. (Note that Research Scientists who will be instructor of record for an academic course must obtain prior approval through the Office of Faculty Affairs.

The expertise and contributions of Research Scientists have substantial impact on the research enterprise at UGA. In general, they are responsible for creative contributions to their field of specialization. In particular, they contribute to development of laboratory infrastructure by, for example, generating funding, managing projects and resources, students, and staff, and strengthening the overall reputation of the unit via significant scholarly activities such as publications in refereed journals and presentations at meetings. Research Scientists charged with managing research service units promote service activities that make the expertise within the university available to external scientists and also strengthen the synergy between industry and the university.

Each Research Scientist position has specific roles and responsibilities reflected in corresponding EFT distributions among Research, Instruction, Service, and Administration, all with emphasis on research functions at the university. The positions are not standardized over the entire university, as requirements depend on the needs of the particular unit. Although assignments may differ, each reflects a level of independence and evidence of future trajectory towards national and international recognition. Review of Research Scientist performance must be based on the specific assignment of duties and EFT distribution.

## **2. Appointment and Promotion**

### **2.1 Requirements for Appointment**

To be eligible for a Research Scientist appointment, a person must have the terminal degree (or equivalent) awarded in one's discipline. This requirement may be waived for individuals with outstanding experience and achievement.

Appointment to and promotion within the Research Scientist series includes consideration of years in rank, levels of experience and accomplishment, degree of independence, evidence of trajectory toward national and international recognition, and impact within one's discipline. Prior service at other colleges/universities or in other related professional activities may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirement for years in rank but are not automatically applicable.

The **Assistant Research Scientist** position is primarily an entry-level faculty position analogous to the Assistant Professor rank. A minimum number of years in a lower rank are not required. Individuals eligible for appointment to this rank should possess strong potential for creative and productive research. In addition, they should show clear potential for obtaining independent research grants or contracts on which they would serve as coprincipal or principal investigators.

The **Associate Research Scientist** position is a faculty position analogous to the Associate Professor rank. Under normal circumstances, candidates for appointment or promotion to this rank must have had four years of experience at the Assistant Research Scientist level (or equivalent) either at the UGA or another institution. A candidate must have demonstrated consistency and direction in his/her research or research service and must have achieved a substantial measure of accomplishment or creative contributions in the field of specialization.

The **Senior Research Scientist** position is a faculty position analogous to the Full Professor rank. An individual would normally be eligible for appointment or promotion to this rank after five years of experience at the Associate Research Scientist (or equivalent) either at the UGA or another institution. The candidate should clearly be independent and should have achieved strong national and international recognition in the field.

### **2.2 Promotion Timeframe**

Promotion of individuals within the Research Scientist series is encouraged. Guidelines for promotion criteria as described above should include consideration of a reasonable schedule of time spent in each rank. Individuals within a Research Scientist rank, however, are not bound by mandatory promotion within a set time frame. However, Research Scientists who have spent a minimum of eight years in either Assistant or Associate rank must receive consideration for promotion if requested.

### **2.3 Compensation Considerations**

Starting salary and salary increases for Research Scientist positions are contingent on the availability of funds. When available and justified, merit-based increases may be given at rates consistent with the current UGA Salary Increase Guidelines (link below). Salary increases may be given at time of promotion at an amount up to but not exceeding the corresponding salary increase for the counterpart tenured/tenure track faculty promotion, as shown in the following

table. UGA Salary Increase Guidelines for the current fiscal year covering merit-based increases and promotion-based increases may be found at [http://busfin.uga.edu/budget/budget\\_quick\\_links/](http://busfin.uga.edu/budget/budget_quick_links/) under “Budget Development”.

Research Scientist track	Tenured/Tenure-track
Assistant Research Scientist	Assistant Professor
Associate Research Scientist	Associate Professor
Senior Research Scientist	(Full) Professor

### 3. Appointment Procedures

The procedures to appoint a research scientist should follow the regular faculty appointment process as managed by the Office of Faculty Affairs (<https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/faculty-appointments/>) with the following three exceptions:

1. Include the Statement of Roles and Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges in the offer letter in addition to the information required in the Office of Faculty Affairs faculty offer letter template.
2. The faculty vote that was taken on the appointment of the candidate should be included in the hiring proposal in UGA Jobs (# Yes/# No/# Abstain)
3. The hiring proposal in UGAJobs for the successful candidate will be routed through the Office of Research for review and approval.

The following sections outline additional policies and give guidance to appointment units.

#### 3.1 Appointment Unit

Under usual circumstances, for appointment of a Research Scientist within a unit (department, school, college, center, institute, etc.), the appointment unit consists of the eligible voting faculty in the unit, including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at the position's rank or above. If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc appointment unit faculty. If the position will reside in or have a significant relationship with more than one unit, then a combined unit faculty should act as the appointment unit faculty and the heads of all units involved should provide input into the search and appointment processes. In such cases, one unit should be chosen as the administrative unit for the purposes of coordinating evaluations and promotion reviews.

#### 3.2 Search Procedures

To conduct a search for a Research Scientist, the appointment unit head should appoint a search and screening committee. Members of the search and screening committee should perform their duties according to the UGA Affirmative Action Plan ([https://eoo.uga.edu/affirmative-action-hiring/search\\_committee\\_guidelines/](https://eoo.uga.edu/affirmative-action-hiring/search_committee_guidelines/)). First, they should prepare a Statement of Roles & Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges. Then, in summary, they should:

- Prepare an advertisement including job description based on roles and responsibilities.
- With approval of the appointment unit head and concurrence of the Director of the Equal Opportunity Office, place the advertisement in media appropriate for the discipline.
- Post the position in the USG Applicant Clearinghouse (required for all faculty positions)
- Screen applicants for the position.
- Identify a pool of applicants who are qualified for the position.
- Arrange and conduct interviews, if appropriate, for qualified applicants.

After a 5 year maximum term of appointment as a Postdoctoral Research Associate, a unit may appoint a Postdoctoral Research Associate to an Assistant Research Scientist position with evidence of exceptional performance and scholarship

and with the following prior approvals: (1) unit faculty approval; (2) appropriate budgetary approval for the Assistant Research Scientist appointment and proposed salary; and (3) Equal Opportunity Office approval for the promotional appointment without a search, which requires that the original postdoctoral appointment was the result of a search. After these approvals are received, the unit may proceed with the standard faculty appointment process.

All other Research Scientist appointments must follow standard UGA faculty hire procedures. Consult the checklist available online at <https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/faculty-appointments/>.

### **3.3 Unit Definition of Privileges**

The Research Scientist rank is expected to convey privileges on par with those afforded tenure-track faculty and beyond those afforded Research Professionals. However, the specific privileges may vary with rank and appointment unit. Thus, for each Research Scientist rank, a Unit Definition of Privileges must be generated to define the exact privileges. The Unit Definition of Privileges may include, but is not necessarily limited to, such things as expectations for attendance at faculty meetings and voting rights with respect to departmental affairs. The Unit Definition of Privileges will be made available to the candidate during the hiring process and will be included with the offer letter.

Units with Research Scientists at the time of this policy revision are strongly encouraged to formulate a Unit Definition of Privileges in consultation with the current Research Scientists in the unit. The Unit Definition of Privileges must be in place prior to the next promotion cycle.

### **3.4 Statement of Roles & Responsibilities / Effort Distribution**

The specific tasks assigned to a Research Scientist may vary across disciplinary boundaries and academic units. Therefore, it is inappropriate to apply the same criteria used for the evaluation of tenure-track faculty to the evaluation of Research Scientists. Consequently, a position-specific Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, including explicit expectations for distribution of effort, will be generated for each Research Scientist position. This Statement will provide the definition against which each Research Scientist is subsequently evaluated for promotion and should be created with this in mind. These specific evaluation criteria will be made available to and discussed with candidates during the hiring process and will be included in the offer letter.

For existing Research Scientists at the time of this policy revision, the promotion unit is strongly encouraged to formulate an explicit Statement of Roles & Responsibilities in consultation with each Research Scientist. This Statement must be in place prior to the next promotion cycle for a particular position.

### **3.5 Selection and Hiring Process / Approval Workflow**

Based on recommendations from the search and screening committee, the appointment unit should vote for candidates by secret ballot. The results of this vote should be reported to the appointment unit head and faculty. The unit recommendation is based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The appointment unit should initiate the hiring proposal in UGAJobs containing the information outlined in Appendix A. The hiring proposal in UGAJobs for the successful candidate will be routed through University Human Resources, the Office of Research and the Office of Faculty Affairs review and approval.

## **4. Annual Evaluations**

An annual evaluation of each Research Scientist will be performed by the appointment/promotion unit head and/or immediate supervisor and documented in a report to be shared with the Research Scientist and retained by the unit head. The criteria for evaluation should be based on the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities for that particular Research Scientist, which may have different proportions of research, teaching, service, and administrative responsibilities, including Student Success Activities, as appropriate. The expectations from each of the EFT categories

should be directly related to the effort level assigned to each responsibility. Feedback should be provided to the Research Scientist on work performance and progress toward promotion. Any changes to the Research Scientist's effort distribution or job description agreed upon during evaluation must be documented in a revised Statement of Roles & Responsibilities. Immediate supervisors are encouraged to solicit input on performance reviews for Research Scientists, if they have not already received it. The outcome of the annual evaluation will form the basis for the unit head sending the annual renewal notification letter, consistent with Board of Regents policy.

The immediate supervisor and/or the unit head may consider the following factors in evaluating the performance of a Research Scientist in these areas:

**Research Activities.** The Research Scientist should be evaluated annually based on research accomplishments such as publication of articles in scholarly journals, where such articles are subjected to peer review in the discipline. Non-refereed articles and local journals should also be taken into consideration, in addition to books, chapters in books, and monographs published or accepted for publication. The Research Scientist should demonstrate independence and innovation appropriate to rank through applications for research grants or contracts or support in preparation of such applications. Any papers for presentations whether at national, international or local meetings of professional organizations should be weighted depending on their impact. Any scientific collaboration with universities, research institutes or industry groups outside UGA should be considered.

**Teaching/Training Activities.** If the Research Scientist is responsible for teaching or training, student, participant, or peer input should be considered in the annual evaluation. The Research Scientist's effectiveness as a teacher and a mentor, indicated by, for example, student evaluations, course syllabi, course handouts and outlines, or peer reviews should be considered. Where applicable, evidence of the ability to revise and update the course content with new developments in the field should be considered. Similarly, where applicable, the Research Scientist should demonstrate accessibility to students outside the classroom or laboratory setting. If the Research Scientist supervises graduate students or postdoctoral associates, the ability to guide and mentor these individuals should be considered. The Research Scientist's role in organizing or teaching workshops/training courses on or off campus should also be considered.

**Management/administrative/leadership Activities.** If the Research Scientist has considerable management or administrative responsibilities, the ability to perform as a manager or administrator and the ability to organize and manage a group of people effectively should be considered. Other criteria that could be considered include grant/contract budget management, reporting requirements, and project or facility management. The evaluations should be based on the job description and consider the level of seniority of the position.

**Service Activities.** The Research Scientist's contribution to excellence in service should be evaluated based on his/her role to the service being performed and the percentage of effort assigned in his/her job description. The Research Scientist's role in the day-to-day operation of a service facility as well the ability to work in a group that is designed for offering service whether on or off campus should be considered. The evaluation may consider activities such as improving the service activities, developing and promoting new services, helping to streamline present service activities making them more accessible to potential clients. Any marketing skills such as speaking at conferences, preparing leaflets, fliers, databases, or websites to promote the service mission of the unit should be viewed positively. Indication of successful contributions could include records of how that service is provided and testimony of effective service to a particular client base.

The above are guidelines to evaluate a Research Scientist's performance and should not be rigidly or uniformly applied in all situations. The guidelines must be interpreted to fit the circumstances of individual faculty in the various disciplines and departments.

## **5. Promotion Procedures**

Timely promotion consideration is encouraged both to recognize and reward accomplishments, to develop productive Research Scientists and research units, and to promote career advancement for the benefit of the individual and unit. While encouraged, promotion advancement is not mandatory for continued employment. That is, there is no maximum number of years permissible at any given rank. However, Assistant or Associate Research Scientists in their eighth year at that rank must receive initial consideration for promotion if requested. Once initiated, the candidate can request that the promotion review process be discontinued at any point.

### **5.1 Promotion Unit**

Under usual circumstances, for promotion of a Research Scientist whose position is within a unit (department, school, college, center, institute, etc.), the promotion unit consists of the eligible voting faculty in the unit, including both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at the position's rank or above. If the unit containing the position has insufficient eligible voting faculty (normally less than five), then the unit head should recruit faculty from related units to serve as an ad hoc promotion unit faculty. If the position resides in or has a significant relationship with more than one unit, then a combined unit faculty should act as the promotion unit faculty and promotion procedures should be coordinated by the head of the chosen administrative unit (see definition of Appointment Unit above).

### **5.2 Timing of Promotions**

Promotion time frames for research scientists parallel those for tenure-track faculty promotion. Under usual circumstances, promotion to Associate Research Scientist is considered a minimum of four years after appointment at assistant rank, including the year when promotion will be considered at the University level. Under usual circumstances, promotion to Senior Research Scientist is considered a minimum of five years after promotion/appointment at the associate rank, including the year when promotion will be considered at the University level. Assistant or Associate Research Scientists who have reached their eighth year at that rank have the right to receive preliminary consideration for promotion, if requested.

Generally, in a given year, promotion-related activities should occur within a time frame appropriate for faculty on academic-year schedules to complete the process and for the President to receive the promotion recommendations by a date in January to be determined annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs. This normally dictates a deadline for promotion recommendations to reach the Office of the Vice President for Research on a date in the preceding November.

### **5.3 Preliminary Consideration**

In consultation with the unit head and faculty colleagues, the candidate must initiate a request for consideration to the unit head during spring of the academic year immediately preceding the academic year during which promotion will be formally considered. The purpose of the preliminary consultation is to organize the candidate's dossier and to provide an initial assessment of progress toward promotion.

The candidate will submit a current vita, Statements of Roles & Responsibilities covering the period under consideration, representative contributions, and a two-page summary highlighting accomplishments related to his/her roles and responsibilities. These materials are used for initial review by the promotion unit.

A unit-level committee comprising a minimum total of five tenure-track faculty and/or Research Scientists at or above the rank being considered must be constituted. The unit-level committee may be the same as for academic promotion, or may include members from that committee, provided members are familiar with the unique roles and responsibilities

of Research Scientists. The committee must submit a recommendation to support or discourage further consideration to the unit head within three days of preliminary consideration. Within three days of receipt of the preliminary unit-level review recommendation, the unit head must inform the candidate, in writing, of the outcome of the preliminary review.

In the event of a positive recommendation, the unit head will normally solicit the names of 4-6 external reviewers from the candidate and 4-6 external reviewers from the unit Research Scientists and tenure-track faculty. Under usual circumstances, these reviewers will be external to UGA. The candidate will then prepare and submit all required promotion documentation to the unit head prior to the end of the spring semester.

The unit head will then identify a subset of reviewers. Normally, a total of 6 reviewers will be identified, ensuring representative balance between the candidate and unit nominations. The unit head will submit to the invited reviewers the candidate's current vita, Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, statement of accomplishments, and documentation appropriate to the roles and responsibilities, as gathered for the initial review. In order to ensure balance between candidate- and unit-selected external reviewers, reviewer declinations and non-responses require that additional reviewers be solicited to ensure that a minimum of 4 reviews are included, balancing candidate and unit nominees. All letters of evaluation received must be included in the dossier.

#### **5.4 Documentation**

In order to address performance accurately and fairly, the dossier must both clarify the nature of the candidate's roles and responsibilities and document performance related to those roles and responsibilities. Each of the following should be customized to align the candidate's roles and responsibilities with associated performance. A dossier outline is provided in Appendix B.

The curriculum vitae should indicate the EFT distribution throughout the period under review, and emphasize those aspects with greatest relevance to the individual's assignment(s). The assignments may include research, administration, instruction or research training, service, including involvement in Student Success Activities, as appropriate, and other responsibilities for which time was allocated, and may vary with changes in roles and responsibilities across the period under review.

The Statement of Roles & Responsibilities that details the candidate's current roles and responsibilities must be included. Changes or significant shifts in roles and responsibilities during the period covered by the evaluation should be identified.

The dossier must also include annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since initial appointment or most recent promotion at the University of Georgia. These annual evaluations detail the candidate's performance during the period under review and should summarize performance based on the candidate's roles and responsibilities.

External assessments are critical to providing balanced and knowledgeable perspectives as to the candidate's performance. Given the importance of accurately aligning the candidate's performance with roles and responsibilities, it is also critical, when soliciting the letters from external reviewers, the unit head should request that external assessments address performance based on the candidate's Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, current vitae, statement of accomplishments, and examples of representative scholarship and quality of performance.

#### **5.5 Promotion Unit Evaluation**

The promotion unit provides the initial substantive evaluation of the candidate's performance relative to the criteria for promotion to each rank. Each component of the dossier must be evaluated relative to the candidate's performance of the roles and responsibilities as specified.

A unit-level promotion review committee should be constituted by the promotion unit head. Committee members must be knowledgeable about the Research Scientist's position and appropriate to evaluating the strength of the Research

Scientist promotion dossier. This committee may consist of the eligible faculty of the unit. The unit head will appoint a chair to oversee committee deliberations and document votes in accordance with the promotion guidelines. The committee will review all dossier documentation, and request further clarification or materials from the candidate or unit head if needed. Individual committee members will cast secret ballot votes to support or not support the promotion application. Under usual circumstances, committee members will vote "Yes" or "No"; committee members cannot vote "Abstain." A vote to recuse one's self from any participation in the review is allowable only when a conflict of interest exists that would preclude his/her ability to render a fair and objective review of a candidate's request for promotion. Such conflicts of interest may include those individuals who have an intimate relationship with the candidate (such as a spouse) or those with professional/business conflicts of interest. The unit recommendation is based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The committee chair will prepare and send a summary of the vote and deliberations to the unit head for inclusion with the promotion documentation. Where the number of eligible voting faculty members exceeds the membership of the promotion review committee, the recommendation of the committee will then be considered in a vote by all eligible unit faculty members and this latter vote will be included in the promotion documentation. The same rules about conflict of interest and simple majority apply.

The unit head will write a letter summarizing the outcome of the unit-level review, including the vote (Yes, No, Recuse). Should the unit head disagree with a positive unit faculty recommendation, he/she must appoint an alternate proponent to write the cover letter. The letter should address the quality of contributions to the unit and the university, highlight significant contributions/performance, and address the continued importance of the candidate to the unit's and university's strategic mission. The letter should also point to relevant evidence contained in the dossier, and highlight relevant comments from external reviews. The letter should also include the unit head's recommendation to support or not support the promotion application. In drafting the letter, the unit head is encouraged to solicit input from supervisors with direct knowledge of the candidate's performance and contributions.

## **5.6 University Review**

All materials in the promotion dossier should be provided with the unit head letter including a summary of the unit evaluation and vote to the Office of the Vice President for Research by the November deadline published for that year. The OVPR appoints a review committee of senior faculty and Senior Research Scientists to examine the documentation for each promotion recommendation. Subject to usual conflict of interest recusals, this review committee votes by secret ballot on each recommendation. The university level decision is based upon a simple majority vote of the eligible review committee membership; a tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The chair of the review committee submits a summary of the deliberations and recommendations to the Vice President for Research, who notifies the candidates of the outcome of the review. All dossiers associated with positive promotion decisions are forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs for final approval by the Provost and President. Negative decisions can be appealed as detailed below.

### **5.6.1.1 Approval Workflow**

This checklist provides a summary of the workflow appropriate to the promotion of Research Scientists. Details of each step have been provided throughout this document.

- Candidate initiates review by notifying promotion unit head.
- Candidate collects/generates documentation for initial consideration.
- Promotion unit reviews/votes on initial consideration.
- Candidate is notified of vote.
- Candidate chooses whether to proceed.
- Promotion unit head notifies unit faculty of candidate decision to proceed.
- If candidate chooses not to proceed, process ends.
- Candidate submits names of potential external evaluators.



- Promotion unit head solicits names of potential external evaluators from unit faculty.
- Candidate prepares complete dossier (Appendix B).
- Promotion unit head selects and requests reviews from external evaluators.
- Promotion unit head sends candidate documentation to external reviewers with specific due date.
- Promotion unit head identifies unit evaluation committee members (this may be the entire set of eligible unit faculty members)
- Promotion unit head makes available candidate promotion documentation, including external assessments, to committee.
- Promotion unit evaluation committee members convene to review documentation.
- Committee chair drafts/submits recommendation (including vote) to promotion unit head.
- If necessary, committee recommendation is used to conduct full unit faculty vote.
- Promotion unit head notifies candidate of outcome of vote and recommendation.
- Candidate chooses whether to proceed.
- Unit head (or alternate proponent) writes letter summarizing unit-level evaluation of candidate promotion.
- All promotion documentation forwarded to OVPR for university level evaluation.
- University evaluation completed.
- Chair of university committee submits letter (including vote) to the Vice President for Research summarizing deliberation and recommendation.
- Candidate notified of university evaluation vote/recommendation.
- Candidate can appeal negative outcome.
- Recommendation prepared by the Vice President for Research
- Documentation submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs, Provost, and President for approval.

## **6. Principle of Flow and Appeals**

Assistant or Associate Research Scientists who receive a negative recommendation on promotion at the unit level may choose to allow the dossier to go forward with the promotion unit recommendation to the Office of the Vice President for Research. This is consistent with the Principle of Flow as defined in the UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Unsuccessful nominations for promotion at the university level may be appealed. Appeal requests should be submitted in writing by the dean/director/department head of the promotion unit to the Vice President for Research within seven days after notification by letter of the candidate's disapproval. The dean/director/department head's appeal request should include a detailed explanation of the relevant circumstances and/or reasons justifying the appeal. This letter of request is the only new information allowed in the Appeals Process.

Appeals may be based either on significant inaccuracies in the record of accomplishment by the candidate as submitted in the dossier or on significant procedural irregularities, either in periodic review and advisement of the candidate or in the process of promotion review, as detailed in this document.

The appeal will be submitted to a separate committee appointed by the Vice President for Research and composed of Senior Research Scientists and Full Professors, who will then make a reappraisal of the candidate's record. The reappraisal will be submitted to the Vice President for Research for a final decision.

## **7. Other Resources**

There is more information from the Office of Faculty Affairs at <http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/faculty-affairs/>

USG policy dealing with nontenure-track personnel can be found at [https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.8\\_non-tenure\\_track\\_personnel](https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.8_non-tenure_track_personnel)

University System of Georgia Board of Regents Personnel policies:  
<https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8>

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Hiring Proposal for Research Scientists

The procedures to appoint a research scientist should follow the regular faculty appointment process as managed by the Office of Faculty Affairs (<https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/faculty-appointments/>) with the following three exceptions:

1. Include the Statement of Roles and Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges in the offer letter in addition to the information required in the Office of Faculty Affairs' faculty offer letter template.
2. The faculty vote that was taken on the appointment of the candidate should be included in the hiring proposal in UGA Jobs (# Yes/# No/# Abstain)
3. The hiring proposal in UGAJobs for the successful candidate will be routed through the Office of Research for review and approval.

The required materials to be supplied with the hiring proposal are detailed in the Office of Faculty Affairs Faculty Appointment procedures.

The following information gives further guidance on particular sections.

#### **Offer Letter**

Include the Statement of Roles and Responsibilities and Unit Definition of Privileges in the offer letter in addition to the information required in the Office of Faculty Affairs' faculty offer letter template.

#### **Curriculum Vitae**

Summarize the candidate's professional activities and attainments in conventional curriculum vitae form.

#### **External Evaluations**

Obtain at least three letters from persons who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. As a rule, do not solicit letters from the candidate's former major professor, close associates, or friends. To the extent possible, obtain letters from disinterested individuals who know the candidate professionally and preferably through publications, presentations, or research service performance. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate; do not solicit supporting letters. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's appointment file. Use the suggested letter presented in Appendix C. If necessary, substitute a transcript of a telephone conversation in lieu of a letter.

## **Appendix B. Dossier for Promotion of Research Scientists**

The purpose of the dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. It should be prepared in a concise manner. Include only summaries in the dossier. The candidate for promotion should also document his/her most important achievements (see Section 3) and may include a maximum of five exhibits with the dossier to provide detailed evidence of these achievements. The contents and organization of the dossier are described below.

### **Section 1: Research Scientist Promotion Summary Sheet**

Use the Recommendation for Promotion Form specific for Research Scientists and other non-tenure track positions available on the Faculty Affairs web site. The deadline announcement posted for the current review cycle should contain a direct link to the appropriate form.

### **Section 2: Cover Letter for Promotion**

Summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's promotion. Include the information specified below. The cover letter shall be the principal letter of evaluation from the promotion unit.

- A. *Background.* List the candidate's research, creative activities, and efforts in research administration and service since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank. Use the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities to guide the emphasis on particular areas.
- B. *Generalizations About the Candidate's Achievements.* Make generalizations about the candidate's professional accomplishments in areas related to the position. Anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages of the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented.
- C. *Assessment of the Candidate's Stature.* Make generalizations about the candidate's regional, national, or international stature among those of his or her specialty and time within the discipline. Again, anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages in the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented.

### **Section 3: Vitae**

Itemize the candidate's professional activities and attainments as described in these guidelines and relevant to the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities. Identify with an asterisk to the left of the entry those publications, presentations, media, exhibitions, performances, or other accomplishments that are of national or international standing. The candidate should add to the end of the vita no more than two pages of description of the candidate's major accomplishments, assessing the impact of each.

### **Section 4: Achievements**

Describe and document the candidate's achievements since appointment or promotion to present rank in relation to the criteria in these guidelines and the Statement of Roles & Responsibilities. Include data and information summaries where appropriate. Achievements sufficiently documented in Section 3 are preferably referenced by page number rather than duplicated in Section 4.

The dossier must also include annual evaluations of the candidate's performance since initial appointment or most recent promotion at the University of Georgia. These annual evaluations detail the candidate's performance during the period under review and should summarize performance based on the candidate's roles and responsibilities.

### **Section 5: External Evaluations**

Obtain the specified number of letters (section 5.3) from external assessors who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. Briefly state the qualifications for each person evaluating the candidate. Provide the external assessors with the candidate's Statement of Roles & Responsibilities, curriculum vitae, and examples of the candidate's best scholarly works and accomplishments. Obtain letters from disinterested individuals

who know the candidate professionally and who are able to judge the candidate's reputation and relative status in the field. Do not solicit letters from the candidate's former major professor, former students, close associates, or friends. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and quality of scholastic achievements; do not solicit supporting letters or personal references. Do not contact anyone the candidate has declared a non-assessor. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's promotion file. Appendix C presents a sample letter format requesting a recommendation for promotion. If necessary, substitute a verbatim transcript of a telephone conversation in lieu of a letter.

## Appendix C. Suggested Letter of Request for Evaluation for Promotion of Research Scientists

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The University of Georgia is considering the promotion of \_\_\_\_\_ from \_\_\_\_\_ to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_. These are research positions but may also involve assigned effort in instruction/training, service, or administration, related to the research mission of the university. The position of \_\_\_\_\_ is analogous to that of a \_\_\_\_\_ on a teaching faculty except that it does not convey tenure. A detailed Statement of Roles & Responsibilities for this particular position is enclosed with this request.

On such promotions we seek expert advice from outside our faculty as well as within it. You have been recommended to us as particularly able to evaluate qualifications for this candidate and this position. We would appreciate your candid opinion of the candidate's qualifications, and any other information you can provide that will help in making a wise decision. We are especially interested in the following:

1. \_\_\_\_\_'s professional competency.
2. The quality and significance of his/her professional achievements, related to the position description.
3. National reputation and relative standing in his/her field.
4. If your own institution had a position available in the candidate's area of competence, would he/she be given favorable consideration for such a position?

Your reply will be kept in confidence. If you believe that another person can better comply with this request, we would welcome your suggestions about who we should contact.

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

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_