

## **Suggested Talking Points for Administrator's Charge to Public Service Promotion Committees in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences**

- Express appreciation to all committee members for serving and also to support staff for their efforts.
- Express to the group this is a solemn responsibility they should take very seriously. The candidates spent a lot of time and energy preparing their dossiers. They deserve the utmost consideration. We hold the public service promotion process in the same regard as professorial tenure. Remember, this is not a popularity contest!
- While professional reputation is a factor, primarily consider the merits of the written material in the dossier. Personal feelings about the candidate should not enter into the decision. As you are aware, our candidates will be a direct reflection of our unit.
- Discuss the promotion-level guidelines and any changes since the last revision. (*This can be read directly from the most current edition of Public Service and Outreach Academic Rank: Guidelines for Appointments and Promotion.*)

### **Specific Points to Highlight:**

- Gauge the candidate's overall contribution. Give special attention to the impact of the candidate's work.
- Assess the strength of the candidates' evaluation made by outside experts' letters of evaluation to determine whether the candidate and the evaluation meet the standards embodied in the guidelines.
- Promotion decisions should be based primarily on two indicators: 1) The individual's job description and superior performance fulfilling the tasks specified in the description; and, 2) The overall contribution to enhancing the reputation of the University of Georgia.
- Voting will be by secret ballot. Vote without bias.
- Conduct deliberations in executive session. These deliberations are confidential. Votes, comments or decisions should not be discussed with anyone outside the committee.

- Please refrain from revealing the membership of this committee, although you are free to reveal your own membership on the committee.
- Adhere to the institution's affirmative action compliance standards. Matters of age, race, handicap, color, sex, national origin, or religious beliefs must not be considered in any decision regarding appointment or promotion. Base consideration of a candidate on qualifications as a member of the academic community.
- Documentation should support the achievement section of the dossier. Emphasis should be on the candidate's achievements since appointed/promoted to present rank. Documentation should clearly demonstrate outstanding contributions to the organization and impact of the outreach work. Documentation should emphasize impact and outcomes rather than the quantity, number of repetitions of a program, number of participants, or number of materials distributed.
- Collaboration – To achieve rank of *Public Service Associate*, candidates must have a documented record of collaboration within public service and outreach and/or across academic departments with the University System of Georgia colleges and universities. To achieve rank of *Senior Public Service Associate*, candidates must have a documented record of collaboration within public service and outreach and across academic departments with the University System of Georgia colleges and universities.
- Terminal Degrees – Work of some service units does not require faculty members to have terminal degrees. Some positions require extensive experience instead of advanced degrees; the impact of the faculty member's efforts is most important.
- Cooperative Extension Regional and National Reputation – The definition of regional will vary depending on the individual. "Regional" shall be defined as being outside one's assigned geographic area. For county Extension agents, regional may include work conducted within the candidate's district or throughout the state. For state specialists, regional denotes work conducted within the southeastern United States. To be deemed national, participants must be present from multiple states.
- Unsuccessful bids for promotion may be appealed. The appeal will be submitted to a separate committee.

## **Voting procedure...**

*(Note to moderator – if only one committee is reviewing dossiers for all ranks, it is suggested that the assistants be reviewed first, the associates second, and the senior associates last, dismissing committee members who hold lower ranks. Committee members may only review and deliberate on dossiers at their rank or below.)*

1. Since all dossiers have been reviewed in advance, the committee will go directly into deliberation.
2. The first reader will give an oral report. The reader will thoroughly highlight strengths and weaknesses of the dossier, but will not give an opinion of whether or not the dossier deserves promotion.
3. The second reader will then add to, or clarify, the comments of the first reader.
4. Following the two oral reports, there will be open discussion by all committee members.
5. A ballot will then be distributed, and a vote taken by secret ballot. Ballots will not be signed. Do not write directly in the dossier notebooks.
6. There will be no abstentions, except where a significant conflict of interest exists such as spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the candidate.
7. The votes will be counted immediately by the committee chair and the result will be announced. After the vote count is tallied, the ballots shall be destroyed.
8. The result of the secret ballot vote will stand without further discussion.
9. For candidates who do not receive a majority of positive votes, the committee will provide written feedback of reasons for the negative vote. All comments should only include language that comes directly from the Public Service Promotion Guidelines handbook (ie. Candidate failed to provide sufficient evidence of a regional and/or national reputation). The written feedback will be typed and made available to candidates and/or their administrative head upon request.
10. The remaining dossiers will be reviewed one-at-a-time following the same procedures.

CAES Guidelines for Promotion Process Committee, 2009

Faith Peppers

Brian Tankersley

Bill Hodge

Judy Hibbs, Chair