

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
Revised Spring, 2006

Approved by the University Council
April 22, 2004, Edited April 29, 2004, Revised Spring 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. [Introduction to the Guidelines](#)
- II. [Glossary](#)
- III. [Appointment, Promotion and Tenure](#)
 - A. [Contributions to Teaching](#)
 - B. [Contributions to Research and Other Creative Activities](#)
 - C. [Contributions in Service to Society, the University and the Profession](#)
- IV. [Requirements for Ranks](#)
- V. [Procedures for Appointments](#)
- VI. [Promotion and Tenure Unit](#)
 - A. [Advisement about Promotion and Tenure](#)
 - B. [Third-year Review](#)
 - C. [Preliminary Consideration](#)
- VII. [Procedures for Promotion](#)
 - A. [Preparing for Promotion and/or Tenure-Unit Evaluation](#)
 - B. [Reviews](#)
- VIII. [Appeals](#)
- IX. [Instructors and Temporary Assistant Professors](#)
- X. [Procedures for Tenure](#)
 - A. [Definition](#)
 - B. [Criteria](#)
 - C. [Regulations](#)
 - D. [Tenure Process](#)

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The University of Georgia is the oldest publicly-chartered institution in the nation and is the land-grant, sea-grant university in the state of Georgia. As such, it has broad responsibilities for promoting the advancement of knowledge in service to the people of Georgia, the nation and the world. Faculty members play a central role in achieving the University's major objectives. For more than two centuries, University faculty have discharged their responsibilities of teaching, research and service in a distinguished manner, consistent with the mission of the institution and the expectations of the state's citizens. The faculty are primarily responsible for attracting the very best students to the institution. For all of these reasons, appointing, developing and retaining an outstanding faculty is critical to the success of the University.

The processes for appointment, promotion and tenure must be fair, rigorous and discipline-appropriate if the University is to attract, retain and recognize faculty excellence. [The University Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure \(Guidelines\)](#) are designed to ensure a process that is focused upon the successful recruitment, development and evaluation of faculty. The purpose of this document is to protect the rights of faculty and meet the needs of the institution. Appropriate department heads and deans must provide newly appointed tenure-track faculty with these [Guidelines](#), as well as with the discipline-specific criteria mandated by these [Guidelines](#). The Glossary of this document defines the key terms and concepts of the [Guidelines](#).

The University's broadly stated mission is to teach, to inquire into the nature of things and to serve society. Primary responsibilities of faculty of the University of Georgia are generally assigned in three areas: (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship and other creative activities, and (3) service to society, the University and the profession. For purposes of promotion and tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate excellence in the faculty member's area(s) of assignment. While there is no standard workload assignment across the institution, faculty workload assignment is usually a mix of time assigned to teaching, research and service. At the University level, the criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure follow from these three areas of primary faculty responsibilities and these Guidelines describe the criteria in general terms. Nevertheless, it is at the level of the appointment unit that discipline-specific criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure must be generated and consistently applied. Appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty must fit a promotion/tenure unit's particular mission within the broader institution, thus the need for criteria at the PTU level.

All review committees [and the University Appeals Committee](#) charged with implementing these Guidelines must use discipline-specific criteria to evaluate the quality of faculty performance relative to decisions regarding promotion and tenure. For new faculty appointments, faculty must demonstrate the capacity or potential to achieve the standards within the PTU, as well as the University. Review committees [and the University Appeals Committee](#) must apply all Guidelines and criteria with fairness. Fairness means that the procedures for recommending a candidate's appointment, promotion and tenure must include safeguards against error; such procedural safeguards are outlined herein.

These Guidelines were formulated on the basis of several foundational principles. Briefly, these principles are as follows:

1. **Faculty Development.** Professional development takes place at all stages of a faculty member's career. New faculty have distinct needs that are specific both to their disciplines and to their stages of career development. Regular feedback through annual evaluations with department heads is essential to ensure that faculty are knowledgeable about how to succeed at the University of Georgia. The third-year review process is an integral part of this feedback process and should serve as one measure to assess the progress of a faculty member within his/her unit. Associate professors and full professors also have distinct career development needs that should be recognized and accommodated at the University of Georgia. For example, senior faculty members may require information about how to succeed as academic leaders of the institution, perhaps contributing more broadly to the mission of the institution and achievements of the University. The purpose of these Guidelines is to articulate appointment, promotion and tenure processes as integral to faculty development in order to create an environment of excellence, honesty and fairness.
2. **Principle of Flow.** The principle of flow was formulated to ensure that a candidate's application receives the fullest and fairest review possible, thus minimizing the potential for biased or erroneous determinations. In accordance with this principle, these Guidelines direct that a candidate's promotion and/or tenure dossier will move forward to the next level of review regardless of whether the lower-level recommendation was positive or negative (although the candidate may terminate the process at any time). The principle of flow therefore provides that faculty colleagues beyond the PTU will review the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure even when such a request has not received a favorable response at the PTU. Similarly, a negative recommendation from a school/college committee will move forward to the University-level committee for additional consideration. Review committees beyond the PTU may affirm the previous recommendation or may identify substantive or procedural errors that require the recommendation to be reversed or reconsidered. Although a candidate may ultimately appeal a denial to the University Appeals Committee, the principle of flow eliminates the necessity for such appeals early in the process, thus reducing the possibility of conflict between the candidate and his/her colleagues within the PTU.
3. **Deference to Decisions of Colleagues Closest to the Discipline.** Although the principle of flow requires that all formal PTU decisions be reviewed at higher levels, these Guidelines nevertheless emphasize that faculty members within a discipline are in the best position to render judgments

about their colleagues' achievements within the PTU. To institutionalize deference to PTU determinations, therefore, these Guidelines require a 2/3 majority to overturn judgments of the PTU and school/college committees. This is the case even though the dossier, regardless of outcome, continues to flow forward to the next level of review.

4. ***Development and Use of Criteria at the Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU).*** Finally, these Guidelines require that each appointment unit develop its own written criteria for promotion and tenure in order to supplement these Guidelines with discipline-specific criteria. A unit's criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the appointment unit, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the school/college and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with these Guidelines and with the discipline-specific criteria produced by the unit. In addition, any changes or updates to these Guidelines or to the unit criteria must be promptly provided in writing to faculty members within the unit. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost also must be notified of and approve any such amendments to a unit's promotion and tenure criteria. Higher-level review committees [and the University Appeals Committee](#) will be provided with a copy of the appointment unit's criteria to use in evaluating a candidate's dossier.
5. ***Development and Use of Bylaws and Procedures at Unit Level.*** In addition to the development of discipline-specific criteria, these Guidelines assume that department/school/college bylaws or procedures exist, or will be developed. These bylaws will describe the procedures that will be used to constitute review committees and otherwise implement these Guidelines.

The University of Georgia is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution. In accordance with federal and state law and with University Policy, no appointment, promotion or tenure decision will be influenced by bias on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, religion, age, veteran status or disability. Policy statements covering equal opportunity affairs and sexual orientation may be reviewed at:

<http://www.uga.edu/eoo> and <http://www.uga.edu/provost/polproc/aapm/gap/general/40114.html>

Voting faculty, committees, heads of PTUs and deans are to consider a candidate's qualifications against the criteria set out in these Guidelines and against discipline-specific criteria developed by the candidate's appointment unit, using only the procedures specified within these official documents.

All employees of the University of Georgia are provided liability coverage by the Georgia Department of Administrative Services and representation by the Office of the Attorney General of Georgia for actions arising out of acts or omissions performed in the scope of employment. All of the activities described in these Guidelines are University functions within the scope of employment duties of University of Georgia faculty and staff.

II. GLOSSARY [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Appointment unit – an administrative unit within the University authorized to recommend the hiring of tenure-track faculty. Usually such units are departments within schools or colleges. In schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, however, the appointment unit will be defined by the school/college faculty as a whole. Faculty in the appointment unit develop the discipline-specific criteria that will be used by the PTU faculty charged with a review. In addition, the appointment-unit faculty develop the procedures that will be used by faculty in the unit charged with conducting faculty searches.

Appointment-unit head – the designated person who is responsible for the administration of an appointment unit. Usually this person is the department head, or, for schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the dean of the school or college.

Assistant professor – the primary entry-level rank for tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia. Assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their disciplines. Individuals in this rank cannot be tenured.

Associate professor – the middle rank for tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia. Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their disciplines.

Candidate – a person being considered for appointment to a tenure-track faculty position, or a tenure-track faculty member under review for promotion and/or tenure, or an assistant professor during the third-year review.

Conflict of interest – a faculty member with a conflict of interest that would preclude his/her ability to render a fair and objective review of a candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure must recuse himself/herself from participation in the review. 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.

Dossier – Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the documentation submitted by a candidate and the appointment-unit head for promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the Appendices to this document that address the required components of the dossier.

Eligible voting faculty – those tenure-track faculty who may vote on appointments, promotions or tenure. All tenured and tenure-track faculty vote on appointments. All associate professors and professors vote on candidates for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor. Only professors vote on candidates for promotion from associate professor to professor. All tenured faculty, regardless of rank, vote on candidates for tenure and candidates under third-year review. All eligible faculty are expected to participate in the PTU evaluation process and to vote, except those who are required to recuse themselves. Eligible faculty may not abstain; however, they must not participate or vote if there is a conflict of interest. Faculty who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters.

Full time – when used in conjunction with employment, this term denotes a 100% workload during either an academic or fiscal-year contract.

Instructor – the rank of instructor is an entry-level position for the University. Candidates often do not have the terminal degree appropriate for their disciplines. Individuals in this rank cannot be tenured, although time earned while serving as instructor counts as time toward tenure.

Levels of Review – recommendations for promotion and/or tenure may be made and reviewed in two or three procedural stages, depending on the organizational structure of the candidate's school or college. For schools or colleges with departments, the first review takes place within the PTU, the second review is performed at the school or college level, and the third review is performed at the University level. For schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the first review takes place within the school or college, which operates as the PTU, and the second review is performed at the University level.

Preliminary Consideration – the vote of eligible voting faculty in the PTU to solicit external letters of evaluation. The candidate must request that he/she be considered for preliminary consideration. The vote of the faculty in the preliminary consideration of the candidate is not included in the dossier that is prepared and submitted for review.

Principle of Flow – a candidate's promotion and/or tenure dossier will move to the next higher level of review [committee](#) regardless of whether the recommendation at a lower level was positive or negative.

Probationary Period – the time period that tenure-track faculty must serve, with the exception of receiving tenure upon appointment, prior to becoming eligible for tenure at the University of Georgia. The probationary period is five years, counting the year in which a faculty member may be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure.

Procedural Errors – errors in the promotion and/or tenure process that may have affected the outcome of a vote. These include: (1) failure to conduct a third-year review or yearly performance evaluations; (2) failure to consult candidates regarding external evaluations; (3) failure of the PTU to vote in accordance with mandated procedures; (4) failure to evaluate a candidate in accordance with PTU criteria; and (5) any other claims regarding failure of the PTU to meet established procedural requirements as mandated by these [Guidelines](#).

Professor – the highest rank for tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia. Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their discipline.

Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) – the organization of tenure-track faculty responsible for conducting votes on promotion and/or tenure decisions. The PTU is defined by the University and by the published bylaws or procedures of the unit, and is usually a department. In schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, however, the PTU will be constituted by the school or college in whatever manner the school or college deems appropriate.

Promotion/Tenure Unit (PTU) Criteria – the written documentation created by the tenure-track faculty within the appointment unit that describes in detail the expectations that must be met before a candidate may earn tenure or be promoted to associate professor or professor. These criteria must be in writing, must be accepted by tenure-track faculty in the appointment unit, and must be approved by the department head and dean of the school/college and by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Any revisions to these unit criteria must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the school/college and by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The PTU must use the written criteria that the appointment units have established for promotion and/or tenure reviews.

~~Quorum – at the PTU level consists of at least two-thirds of faculty eligible to vote. Absentee ballots do not count toward the quorum, but may be cast as long as they are received by the PTU head before the meeting begins. Otherwise, absentee ballots will be disregarded.~~

Review Committees – Includes the review committees for schools/colleges with departments and university level review committees.

Scholarship – the intellectual activities expected of every tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia as he/she carries out the University's missions: teaching, research and service.

~~School/College Committee – in schools or colleges with departments, the committee(s) is (are) appointed by the dean; these Guidelines recommend that these committees consist of at least five eligible faculty members. No committee member may vote twice on a candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, and must therefore be recused from voting on any candidate from the member's own PTU. In schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the school or college operates as the PTU.~~

School/College-Level Review – consideration of the PTU recommendation (positive or negative) by the school/college committee, except in schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, in which case the school/college operates as the PTU and its recommendations are reviewed by the University review committee. Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.

Senior Faculty – associate professors and professors at the University of Georgia.

Tenure – the status granted by the University of Georgia to associate professors or professors, either upon appointment or after a probationary period, ensuring protection against dismissal except for cause.

Tenure-Track Faculty – faculty members at the University of Georgia who hold the positions of assistant professor, associate professor or professor. This term often is used in an inclusive fashion and may describe both untenured and tenured faculty members.

Terminal Degree – the highest degree awarded in a discipline. For most disciplines, the doctorate is the terminal degree, except for a few areas such as studio arts.

Third-Year Review – a faculty committee of the PTU reviews the achievements and performance of assistant professors at the end of their third year of appointment, using the written criteria developed by the unit. The intent of

this review is to provide assistant professors with feedback (in writing) regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure, including the vote for continuance of the candidate. This vote is advisory to the PTU head and/or the dean. The letter documenting feedback from the third-year review must be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier at the time of the review.

University Appeals Committee – The University-level committee that reviews negative recommendations for promotion and/or tenure from the University Review Committee. The appeals committee is chaired by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (who is an ex-officio, non-voting member) and consists of ~~fourteen senior faculty members~~, **tenured full professors, one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia. The representative from the Graduate School must be a member of the Graduate Council, including a faculty member representing the Graduate Council. A quorum consists of at least two-thirds of the committee membership.**

University-Level Review – is conducted by the University Area Review Committees, organized into general discipline area committees. Each area committee will consist of at least seven tenured professors, nominated by the deans of the University's schools and colleges, and appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The committee chair is elected by the members of a particular committee. These committees review recommendations concerning promotion and/or tenure from the school/college review committees. **Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.**

~~Votes – at the PTU level, all recommendations are to be determined based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty. A tie is interpreted as a negative vote. The tally of the vote is to be reported to the candidate within three working days from the date the vote is taken.~~

~~Vote for Reversal of Lower Level Review – a 2/3 majority of eligible voters is required for a school/college or University review committee to overturn a recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure provided by the next lower level of review.~~

Years in Rank – the time a tenure-track faculty member has served in a particular position. For tenure considerations, prior service as faculty at other colleges/universities or prior service in other appropriate professional activities may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirements for years in rank. According to Regents' policies, faculty members must meet the standard of being full-time employees during two semesters for a year to count toward tenure under the semester system. Questions about fractional years should be referred to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

III. APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure at the University follow from the University's mission to teach, to inquire into the nature of things and to serve society. University of Georgia faculty must meet the following primary responsibilities: teaching; research, scholarship or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. Academic appointment, promotion and tenure are based upon a candidate's performance in these assigned areas. Faculty eligible to vote are expected to participate in the critical activities of faculty appointment, promotion and tenure, except when there exists a significant conflict of interest. See glossary for definition of Eligible Voting Faculty.

A. Contributions to Teaching [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The Standard

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

Documentation

Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the sources listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution.

1. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
2. Development or significant revision of programs and courses.
 - a. Preparation of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula or programs of study.
 - b. Collaborative work on interdisciplinary courses, programs and curricula within the University or across institutions.
3. Effectiveness shown by student evaluations and accomplishments.
 - a. A list of courses and information from student questionnaires designed to reflect teaching effectiveness and creativity, rather than popularity. In such cases, information for all courses taught in the previous three years that have been evaluated should be included unless a candidate seeks early promotion, in which case information for two years is sufficient. The candidate should report quantitative data for items that provide summary evaluations of the course and instructor, if collected by the department or unit.
 - b. Representative student comments that attest to a teacher's abilities to arouse student interest and to stimulate their work should be reported for the previous three years. Candidates seeking early promotion may provide this information for the previous two years.
 - c. Evaluation by students being trained in clinical, laboratory, field or teaching-hospital activities.
 - d. Letters of evaluation from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional performance both within the traditional classroom setting and beyond it.
 - e. Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses.
 - f. Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including information to show the students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
 - g. Effective direction of graduate study including theses and dissertations.
 - h. Evidence of students coming from other institutions especially to study with the teacher.
 - i. Successful direction of individual student work such as independent studies, special student projects and student seminars.
 - j. Evidence of effective advisement of students.
4. Effectiveness shown by peer evaluation of expertise in instruction.
 - a. Peer evaluations by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
 - b. Selection for teaching special courses and programs.
 - c. Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation and international study and development projects.
 - d. Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams and special commissions.
 - e. Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.
5. Publication activities related to teaching.
 - a. Textbooks, published lecture notes, abstracts, articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and scholarship.
 - b. Adoption of a candidate's textbooks, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.
 - c. Presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.

6. Grants related to instruction.
 - a. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or to fund stipends for students.
 - b. Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs.
7. Election to offices, committee activities and other important service to professional associations and learned societies including editorial work and peer review as related to teaching.
8. Departmental and institutional governance and academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching.
9. Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students.

B. Contributions to Research and Other Creative Activities [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The Standard

Research and creative accomplishments are the studious inquiry or examination, especially critical investigation or experimentation, that have as their purpose to improve the development, refinement and application of knowledge. These examinations may include revisions of accepted conclusions, interpretations, theories or laws in light of newly discovered facts, or the practical applications of such new or revised conclusions, interpretations, theories or laws. Creative activities include innovative work in the fine and performing arts; for example, the production of original paintings, sculptures, ceramics, musical compositions, novels, plays, poetry and films; the development of plans for projects in architecture and landscape design; and fresh interpretations in the performing arts of music, drama and dance.

Inquiry and originality are central functions of the University. Faculty are to discover new ideas, to fashion new interpretations of enduring ideas, and to participate in the application of these ideas. Consequently, faculty should conduct research or engage in other creative activities appropriate to their disciplines and to the missions of their appointment units, and they should disseminate the results of their work through media appropriate to their disciplines. Interdisciplinary and collaborative works are valid forms of scholarly activity and will be judged as such as long as each candidate gives clear evidence of his/her participation in each instance.

Faculty whose work assignments include research or other creative activities should clearly demonstrate high quality in these endeavors. The University distinguishes between the routine and the outstanding as judged by the candidate's peers at the University of Georgia and elsewhere. The principal standard should always be quality rather than quantity.

Documentation

Evidence of research or other creative activities includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. In joint endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution (e. g. first author, supervisor).

1. Research and/or scholarly publications (indicate if peer-reviewed).
 - a. Books, parts of books, reviews, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals, discipline-specific publications (i.e. law reviews), articles published in professional publications, research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, research notes and bulletins.
2. Creative products.
 - a. Exhibition, installation, production or publication of original works of architecture, dance, design, electronic media, film, journalism, landscape architecture, literature, music, theater and visual arts.

- b. Performance, recording or production of dance, literary, musical, visual arts or theatrical works from traditional or contemporary repertoires of the performing arts, or other artistic works.
3. Membership on editorial boards reviewing publications, juries judging art works or juries auditioning performing artists.
4. Scholarly reviews of the candidate's publications.
5. Funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.
6. Presentation of research papers before technical and professional meetings.
7. Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (e.g. patents, new product development, new art forms, citation index analysis).
8. Record of participation in and description of seminars and workshops (including short descriptions of activity, with titles, dates and sponsor); indication of role in seminar or workshop (e. g. leader, participant).
9. Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (e.g. consultant, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journal, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions).
10. Description of new courses and/or programs developed, including service-learning and outreach courses at home or abroad, where research and new knowledge are integrated.
11. Description of new computer software, video or multimedia programs developed.
12. List of honors or awards for scholarship.
13. Lists of grants and contracts for improvement of instruction, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering grants and contracts.
14. Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, or educational institutions.
15. Technology transferred or adapted in the field.
16. Technical assistance provided.
17. Other evidence of impact on society of research scholarship and creative accomplishment.
18. Evidence of graduate and post-doctoral students' scholarly achievements (e.g. publications, awards, grants).
19. Election to offices, committee activities and important service to professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work and peer review as related to research and other creative activities.

C. Contributions in Service to Society, the University and the Profession [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The Standard

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. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as service to society for purposes of promotion and tenure if the following conditions are met:

1. There is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise.
2. There is a direct application of knowledge to, and a substantive link with, significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns.
3. The ultimate purpose is for the public or common good.
4. New knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele.
5. There is a clear relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission.

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in departmental, school/college and/or University committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a college representative on a major University committee or task force); and developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects.

Service to the profession includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; and review of grants applications.

Documentation

Evidence of the effectiveness of service to society, the University and the profession includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. In joint endeavors, the degree each person contributes should be identified.

1. Honors, awards and special recognition for service activities.
2. Program and project development and other creative activities.
 - a. Overview of needs assessment, and the objectives, methods and target audience. Description of selected activities and/or products that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to the program.
 - b. Description of how the program is compatible with unit and University missions, and how the activities complement the teaching and research missions of the unit and/or University.
 - c. Description of the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and implementation of the program. Did the activities demonstrate or test the applicability of the candidate's discipline to societal/human problems, require integration with other disciplines and/or generate new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience? How was this knowledge communicated to broader audiences? Has the program led to increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences?
 - d. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative evidence (e.g. changes in test scores, increased production or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative evidence (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics) should be included.
3. Service-based instructional activities.
 - a. Listing of the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (e.g. curriculum, course, workshop), the duration, the candidate's role in creating each, the target audience and the method of reaching the audience (e.g. conference presentation, site visit).
 - b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.
4. Consultation and technical assistance.
 - a. Listing of each type of assistance, the clientele, the contribution and the number of times provided.
 - b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.
5. Applied research.
 - a. Listing of publications relating to service to society including books, book chapters, articles and scholarly papers (indicate if peer-reviewed).
 - b. Quality and impact of written documents produced, including knowledge integration, creative solutions, technical manuals or other outcomes of applied research as evaluated by clientele and peers.

6. Service products.
 - a. Exhibitions: Distinction between juried or invitational exhibits; identification of work(s) and juror (juries); and/or indication of regional, national or international exhibitions.
 - b. Electronic products (e.g. computer programs, web sites, CDs).
7. Copyrights, patents and inventions related to service activities.
8. Contracts, grants and gifts related to service activities.
9. Other service activities.
 - a. Selection for special service activities outside the state or nation.
 - b. Securing competitive grants and contracts to finance development and delivery of service innovations.
 - c. Requests by individuals from outside the state or nation to study the candidate's work and innovations.
 - d. Development of patents or instruments useful in solving important problems.
 - e. Performance of clinical activities in veterinary hospitals, psychology clinics, reading clinics, clinical pharmacy sites, special education clinics and other clinical settings.
10. Documentation of candidate's role in:
 - a. Committee work at departmental, school/college and/or University levels.
 - b. University governance bodies and related activities.
 - c. Development, implementation or management of academic programs, projects or study-abroad initiatives.
 - d. Professional and learned societies, including election to offices, committee activities, editorial work, peer review and other important service.
 - e. Development and organization of professional conferences.
 - f. Reviewing grant applications; and,
 - g. Editing and reviewing of manuscripts for professional association and learned societies' publications.

IV. REQUIREMENTS FOR RANKS [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Each rank has distinct requirements in terms of terminal degree, years in rank and expected levels of performance for each of the criteria, consistent with Board of Regents policy and the requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Terminal degree refers to the highest degree awarded in a discipline; the doctorate is the terminal degree for most disciplines within the University except for a few areas such as the studio arts.

Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor for candidates who have not earned the appropriate terminal degree in their respective disciplines. Strong justification is also required in providing support for any recommendation for early promotions. A promotion is considered early if the candidate will have completed fewer than the following number of years in rank at the University of Georgia: three years as instructor being recommended to assistant professor; four years as assistant professor being recommended to associate professor; five years as associate professor being recommended to professor.

Prior service as faculty at other colleges/universities or prior service in other appropriate professional activities (as defined by the PTU and approved by the dean) may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirements for years in rank. A maximum of three years probationary credit may be granted for this service. Probationary credit must be requested at the time of appointment.

Instructor

The rank of instructor is an entry-level position for the University. Requirements include the following:

Degree: Candidates may or may not have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Candidates do not need a minimum number of years in a lower rank.

Criteria: Candidates should show promise of moving toward excellence in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments.

Assistant Professor

The rank of assistant professor is the primary entry-level position for employment as a faculty member at the University. Requirements include the following:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Candidates do not need a minimum number of years in a lower rank unless the initial appointment was at the instructor level at the University of Georgia.

Criteria: Candidates should show promise of moving toward excellence in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments.

Associate Professor

The rank of associate professor is the mid-career faculty rank at the University. Requirements include the following:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Under usual circumstances, candidates must serve at least four years as assistant professor, including the year when the promotion will be considered at the University level, before they are eligible for promotion to associate professor.

Criteria: Candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities unless their work assignments are specifically at the local or state level.

Professor

The rank of professor is the highest rank at the University. Requirements include the following:

Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.

Years in Rank: Under usual circumstances, candidates must serve at least five years as associate professor, including the year when the promotion will be considered at the University level, before they are eligible for promotion to professor.

Criteria: 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.

Exceptions to the requirement of the terminal degree for appointments to professorial ranks may be made for individuals whose experience and accomplishments compensate for, or make irrelevant, the lack of a terminal degree. A request for an exception is subject to approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost following receipt of supporting documentation and the recommendation of a dean.

V. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

When filling a full-time faculty position, the appointment unit head, director or dean will appoint a search and screening committee. Members of the search and screening committee will perform their duties according to Affirmative Action Guidelines, University policy and discipline-specific criteria and procedures. The responsibilities of a search and screening committee in general are as follows:

- prepare a position description;
- prepare an advertisement;
- place the advertisement in national media appropriate for the discipline, as well as in media that will facilitate the attraction of a diverse pool of candidates for the position;
- screen applicants for the position;
- identify a pool of applicants who are qualified for the position; and

- arrange interviews for qualified applicants. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (or his/her designee) must interview applicants for positions of professor, department head or higher.

Faculty members eligible to vote in the appointment unit shall vote by secret ballot to recommend candidates for full-time, tenure-track appointments in the unit. This vote will be reported to the faculty of the appointment unit, as well as to the department head or dean. See glossary for definition of Eligible Voting Faculty.

The dean (or his/her designee) reviews the vote of the appointment unit and any recommendations developed by the search committee, and forwards his/her recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The President, after approving the appointment, forwards the recommendation to the Chancellor's office. All faculty appointments must be presented to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia for final approval.

VI. **PROMOTION AND TENURE UNIT** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The PTU is defined by the University and by the published bylaws or procedures of the unit, and is usually a department. However, in schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the PTU will be constituted by the school or college in whatever manner the school or college deems appropriate, consistent with their written bylaws.

Each unit is required to develop its own criteria for promotion and tenure which must be implemented by the PTU. These discipline-specific criteria may be written at the PTU or school/college level (or both) consistent with the wishes of the faculty of the unit and approved by the dean. These criteria must be in writing, must have the broad support of the faculty in the appointment unit, must be consistent with these [Guidelines](#), and must be approved by the appropriate PTU head and/or dean, and by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. It is the primary function of the PTU to evaluate a candidate's dossier rigorously, exercising the judgment and discretion necessary in evaluating a candidate's overall contributions, following the criteria developed by the PTU and/or college and appropriately approved.

A. **Advisement about Promotion and Tenure** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

When a new faculty member is employed, the appropriate department head or dean will give the faculty member a copy of these [Guidelines](#) and the specific written promotion and tenure criteria of the appointment unit. The head of the PTU (department head, dean or designee) will meet with the new faculty member to discuss these [Guidelines](#) and PTU criteria, and specifically advise the new faculty member about promotion and tenure at the University of Georgia. Faculty generally have assignments in areas central to the mission of the University: teaching; research, or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. Faculty may also have assignments in study-abroad programs, and in collaborative educational programs between or among teaching, research or service units. The faculty member's assigned workload must allow time for satisfying the requirements for promotion and tenure. Questions about workload assignment should be addressed first to the PTU head and then to the dean of the school/college. However, it is ultimately the responsibility of the individual faculty member to be aware of the criteria in his/her appointment unit, as well as in these [Guidelines](#).

Every instructor, assistant professor and associate professor must receive a written annual evaluation conducted according to the defined criteria of the PTU, consistent with Board of Regents policy. This review will include consultation by the appointment unit head with the faculty member and preparation of a written report to the faculty member, who may respond to the report in writing.

B. **Third-Year Review** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

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 and requests to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the third year of appointment, preliminary consideration for promotion and/or tenure will replace the third-year review.** These Faculty members **undergoing third-year review** will prepare their dossiers 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 (see Appendix C). 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 will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. 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 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.

In any year, a department head/dean may determine not to extend a contract to a nontenured faculty member. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the head by the unit faculty, consistent with the department and the PTU's written criteria.

C. Preliminary Consideration [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

In order to receive preliminary consideration for promotion and tenure, the candidate must request that she/he be considered. Such a request suffices to receive preliminary consideration, which typically occurs in the spring prior to the academic year in which the promotion review process would occur. Each year, the PTU head will convene (or contact, if the unit has faculty in various locations) the unit faculty eligible to vote so they may consider those individuals who are being evaluated for promotion and tenure. Based on an updated vita and other materials deemed relevant by the unit, the eligible faculty will decide whether or not to proceed with the promotion and/or tenure process for those faculty requesting preliminary consideration. The unit head is responsible for informing the candidate within three business days of the vote of the unit's recommendation on whether or not he/she will be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. The PTU head's vote need not be revealed at this point. Preliminary consideration is not a formal part of the promotion and/or tenure process. Therefore, the outcome of the vote for preliminary consideration will not appear in the dossier.

If the preliminary consideration is positive, and unless the candidate requests in writing otherwise, then the unit head proceeds with the review process and seeks external letters. If the preliminary consideration is negative, the PTU head will not proceed with the process nor seek external letters except as follows:

Assistant professors who are in their fifth probationary year will be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure if they so request. Assistant professors who are in their sixth or subsequent probationary year must be reviewed unless they request not to have the review. Accordingly, in these cases, the unit head will proceed with the review and seek external letters regardless of the preliminary consideration vote.

The review process will proceed for faculty seeking promotion from associate professor to professor the first year in which an eligible candidate wishes to be reviewed and every fifth calendar year thereafter.

VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The procedures for promotion include four major activities: (1) advising faculty on promotion, (2) initiating the promotion process, (3) evaluating and making recommendations from the PTU, and then (4) reviewing the dossier and making recommendations at higher levels. Except at the discretion of the unit head

following consultation with the appropriate faculty, faculty who have been informed in writing that their contracts will not be renewed following a specified year will not be reviewed for promotion or tenure. Generally, 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 February 1~~ **by a date in January to be determined annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs**. It is important for the candidate and the institution that the dossiers be well-prepared and that review committees evaluate each recommendation for promotion on the merits of the case presented following these Guidelines.

A. **Preparing for Promotion and/or Tenure Unit Evaluation** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Two key steps in preparation for evaluation are the responsibilities of the PTU head and the candidate. First, a dossier must be prepared for evaluation by the appropriate PTU faculty. Preparation and verification of the contents of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the PTU head and the candidate, with the candidate having the final say about the dossier's contents, except for the requirement that all external letters of review be included. Appendix C describes the elements required for the dossier.

For purposes of the PTU's evaluation, only Sections 3 (Unit Criteria), 4 (Vita), 5 (Achievements) and 6 (External Evaluations) of the dossier need to be included, unless the PTU's own procedures require the entire dossier. Sections 1 (Regents Summary Sheet) and 2 (Cover Letters) are prepared following the PTU's evaluation.

While the faculty member is responsible for assuring that all relevant and salient information is available, and for preparing the vita according to these Guidelines, the unit head is responsible for preparing Section 5 in a succinct and factual manner and having the candidate review and approve it for accuracy. The faculty member must have reasonable access to departmental facilities and services to prepare the vita and to organize information for the unit head to use in preparing Section 5 of the dossier. Prior to the evaluation, the candidate should review Sections 4 and 5 to assure that the information is accurate and includes all significant information.

The second key responsibility of the PTU head is to obtain objective and impersonal external appraisals of the quality of the candidate's contributions from persons highly qualified to provide an assessment. Preferably five such appraisals will be obtained, but in any event the PTU evaluation cannot be conducted with fewer than four external appraisals available, at least two of which must be from a list of potential external evaluators supplied by the candidate. Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors and personal friends. Appendix C describes this process more fully, and Appendix E provides a sample form for requesting external letters of evaluation.

The candidate constructs a list of up to six potential external evaluators and their qualifications as reviewers. The PTU head must select and include in the dossier letters of evaluation from at least two of the candidate's designated external reviewers and will inform the candidate in writing when the letters have arrived. The candidate also constructs a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. There should be no contact at all with these individuals during the promotion and/or tenure review. The dossier must also include at least two letters from individuals not on the candidate's approved list. If one or two of the external evaluators cannot or do not respond, another letter may be requested, maintaining a balance of letters from the candidate's list of letters and from the PTU's list. *All letters of evaluation must be included in the dossier.*

If the unit head is an associate professor, then the head, following consultation with the PTU, will appoint a professor to chair the committee to review candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. If the unit head is untenured, then the head, following consultation with the PTU, will appoint a tenured professor to chair the committee to review candidates for tenure. The unit head will retain responsibility for working with the candidate to prepare the dossier for review, although the appointed chair will take responsibility for preparing Sections 1 and 2 after the unit evaluation is completed.

B. **Reviews** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Normally, the promotion and tenure dossier will be subject to three levels of review: the first review takes place within the PTU, when it renders its recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure. Following this review by the PTU, the dossier will be reviewed at the school/college level and then at the University level. This three-level review process will take place in those schools and colleges with departments. However, in schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, there will generally be two levels of review: the first is at the school level and the second is at the University level. In these units, the school/college serves as the PTU. All reviews must be conducted in a rigorous and equitable manner and must be free of political influence.

1. Promotion/Tenure-Unit Review.

Voting Procedures for PTU: All eligible voting faculty are expected to participate in the PTU evaluation process by voting yes or no. Faculty from the candidate's PTU will refrain from participating in any form of evaluation at all higher levels of review.

- **Quorum:** Consists of at least two-thirds of those faculty members eligible to vote on a given candidate. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.
- **Absentions:** No abstentions are allowed.
- **Recusal** – Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier.
- **Absentee Ballots** - Absentee ballots are allowed but do not count toward the quorum. They may be cast in writing so long as they are received by the PTU head before the meeting begins. Absentee ballots received after the meeting begins will be disregarded.
- **Recommendations** – Determined based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty. A tie is interpreted as a negative vote.

The PTU head convenes the appropriate faculty to conduct the PTU evaluation. Faculty eligible to vote within their promotion and tenure units are as follows:

On promotion to associate professor, all associate professors and professors;

On promotion to professor, all professors;

On tenure, all tenured faculty members.

~~All eligible faculty are expected to participate in the PTU evaluation process by voting yes or no, except for those who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest. There will be no abstentions at the PTU level. The dossier will be considered at a meeting scheduled for this purpose, with a quorum consisting of at least two-thirds of those faculty eligible to vote. Absentee ballots do not count toward the quorum, but may be cast in writing so long as they are received by the PTU head before the meeting begins. Otherwise, they will be disregarded. Absentee ballots are disallowed at all other levels of review (i.e., school/college, university, appeals). Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion and consideration of the candidate's dossier. Faculty from the candidate's PTU will refrain from participating in any form of evaluation at higher levels of review.~~

Eligible faculty within the PTU will vote by secret ballot, except for the PTU head. The total number of yes and no votes must be recorded. More yes than no votes

must be recorded in order for the candidate to be approved. The PTU head's vote must be revealed at the time the votes are counted. All absentee and regular ballots must be counted by two faculty members, with the results presented to the faculty before adjournment. The candidate must be informed of the results of the vote, including the tally, within three working days of the meeting.

Consistent with the principle of flow, all promotion and tenure dossiers move to the next level of review, regardless of the vote, unless the candidate indicates he/she does not wish to be considered further.

It is the responsibility of the PTU head to prepare Sections 1 (Regents Summary Sheet) and 2 (Cover Letter) of the dossier. If the PTU head voted against the promotion, then the candidate may designate a senior faculty member from the PTU to substitute for the PTU head. This person prepares Sections 1 and 2. Before a dossier goes forward, the candidate should review Sections 1 through 4 for accuracy. Before the candidate does so, however, identification of any external evaluators must be deleted. Since Section 1 reports results and Section 2 represents a synthesis of faculty judgment, the candidate may correct only manifest errors in reported facts.

Unless the PTU head voted against the candidate, the dossier goes forward with a cover letter from the PTU head (or his/her designee). The candidate **will have five working days to** ~~may~~ read and respond in writing to any cover letter or rationale before it goes forward. The candidate must have access to this information, which includes the vote of the eligible PTU faculty. Whether or not the PTU head prepares the cover letter, he/she (or designee) is responsible for preparing a summary of the procedural steps followed by the PTU in reaching its vote, including relevant dates where appropriate. This statement is to be forwarded with the dossier.

Joint Appointments: If a faculty member has a joint appointment with .50 eft assigned to each of two promotion- and tenure-granting academic units, then either unit may initiate consideration for promotion and prepare the documentation. The documentation will be made available to the appropriate faculties of the two academic units concerned. The vote of each unit should be recorded in the dossier and provided to the candidate. If both units vote to grant promotion, the dossier flows to the next higher level for review. However, if one unit votes to promote the candidate and the other unit votes to deny, the dossier is forwarded to the University Appeals Committee for action.

2. School/College-Level Review.

Schools/Colleges without Departments:

In those schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the first level of review takes place within the school/college, which serves as the PTU and follows all procedures for the PTU review as outlined in the previous section. This review takes place in accordance with the school/college's written criteria for promotion and/or tenure, and in a manner that is consistent with these [Guidelines](#). In these units, the dean will not serve as the PTU head. The school/college will establish written procedures for the selection of the PTU head.

Schools/Colleges with Departments:

In those schools or colleges with departments, the first level of review takes place in the PTU in accordance with its written criteria for promotion and/or tenure. Upon completion of that first-level review, the PTU will transmit the candidate's dossier to the school/college review committee(s) in accordance with the procedures outlined above. At that time, the candidate, PTU head or senior faculty member designated

by the candidate may supplement the record with claims regarding procedural error, if necessary. In all cases, at the school/college committees review, the committee will review the case to ensure that no procedural error exists. The committee also will ensure that the candidate meets the criteria specified in these Guidelines, as well as criteria specified by the PTU.

- a. *Deference to Initial Determination.* The burden of evaluating the qualifications and suitability of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure is greatest at the first level of review. Significant weight will be given at the higher levels of review to the judgments and recommendations of lower-level review committees (particularly at the PTU level) and to the principle of peer review.
- b. *Appointment and Composition of the School/College Committees.* The dean appoints the members of the school/college review committee(s); these Guidelines recommend that such committees consist of at least five eligible faculty members of the school/college. The chair is elected from among the tenured professors of the committee.
- c. *Voting Procedures for Schools/Colleges with Departments:*
 - **Quorum:** Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.
 - **Abstentions:** No abstentions are allowed.
 - **Recusal** – Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier. No committee member may vote twice on a candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, and must therefore be recused from voting on any candidate from the member's own PTU.
 - **Absentee Ballots** – No absentee ballots are allowed.
 - **Recommendations** - The PTU's recommendation may be reversed only if a 2/3 majority of the eligible committee members who are present at the meeting vote to reverse the outcome at the lower level. Refer to the next section regarding cases where a school/college review committee concludes that a procedural error exists that has not been properly evaluated or remedied at the PTU level.

Voting will be conducted by secret ballot with two designated faculty members assigned to count the ballots. ~~No members will abstain or recuse themselves unless a significant conflict of interest exists requiring such recusal. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in or be present for consideration and discussion of the candidate's dossier. No committee member may vote twice on a candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, and must therefore be recused from voting on any candidate from the member's own PTU.~~

- d. *Additional Procedures for School/College Review Committees* ~~from Schools/Colleges with Departments.~~ In those schools or colleges with departments, the first level of review takes place in the PTU in accordance with its written criteria for promotion and/or tenure. Upon completion of that

~~first-level review, the PTU will transmit the candidate's dossier to the school/college review committee(s) in accordance with the procedures outlined above. At that time, the candidate, PTU head or senior faculty member designated by the candidate may supplement the record with claims regarding procedural error, if necessary. In all cases, at the school/college committees review, the committee will review the case to ensure that no procedural error exists. The committee also will ensure that the candidate meets the criteria specified in these Guidelines, as well as criteria specified by the PTU.~~

~~The PTU's recommendation may be reversed only if at least 2/3 majority of the committee members vote to reverse the outcome at the lower level.~~

Where a School/College Review Committee concludes that procedural error(s) exist that have not been properly evaluated or remedied at the lower-level of review, the School/College Review Committee may take one of the following actions:

(1) Remand the case to the PTU if such error can be corrected within the current promotion/tenure cycle, with instructions concerning how to proceed thereafter.

(2) Find that the procedural error was fatal to the candidate's ability to achieve a fair evaluation of the record at the PTU level or a record worthy of promotion and/or tenure. A finding of such fatal procedural error by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible school/college review committee members will nullify a negative PTU vote. The committee will then vote, based on all available information, including knowledge that a fatal procedural error occurred, on the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure. The resulting recommendation of the school/college review committee, based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty, will be forwarded to the University Review Committee in place of the nullified PTU vote. A tie vote is interpreted as a negative vote.

(3) With the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible.

(4) Determine that any procedural error was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate's application.

- e. Regardless of the outcome of the school/college vote (favorable or unfavorable) the dossier will be forwarded for a review at the University level. In addition, the committee must record the rationale for its decision to affirm or reverse the lower-level decision. This rationale must be in writing and must be transmitted, along with the tally of the vote, to the candidate, who will have the opportunity to respond to the committee's rationale within seven working days. The rationale of the school/college vote and any such response of the candidate will be included in the dossier for consideration at the University level.

~~If the school/college committee finds a clear procedural error that likely affected the substantive outcome of the lower-level review process, it may remand the case for correction of the error by the PTU if such error can be corrected within the current promotion/tenure cycle, after which the case will be resubmitted to the school/college committee. In the event that the~~

~~procedural error cannot be corrected at the lower level, the committee may, with the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible. Cases may occur in which the procedural error fatally undermined the candidate's ability to achieve a record worthy of promotion or tenure. In order to remedy such an error, the committee may vote positively on the candidate's application. The committee may also determine that any procedural error at the lower level was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate's application for tenure, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate's application.~~

- f. ~~*Procedures for Schools/Colleges without Departments.* In those schools or colleges without departments and reporting directly to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the first level of review takes place within the school/college, which serves as the PTU. This review takes place in accordance with the school/college's written criteria for promotion and/or tenure, and in a manner that is consistent with these Guidelines. In these units, the dean will not serve as the PTU head. The school/college will establish written procedures for the selection of the PTU head.~~

Role of the Dean: (was e.)

All promotion and tenure decisions (including both positive and negative decisions) must be sent to the dean of the school/college for review. The dean (or the dean's designee) will provide a thorough, independent evaluation of each candidate for promotion and/or tenure. By this means, the dean will achieve several important objectives of the promotion and/or tenure process. These include: (1) ensuring consistency in the application of the standards for promotion and tenure within the school/college; (2) promoting fairness in the promotion and/or tenure process; and (3) seeing to it that candidates for tenure are central to the mission of the unit and school/college.

The dean (or his/her designee) will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the school/college review committee(s). After the vote has been taken at the school/college level, the dean (or his/her designee) will write a letter evaluating the candidate, introducing the dossier as it goes forward to the University Review Committee. The letter will include the vote of the appropriate faculty of the PTU, as well as the vote of the school/college review committee. The candidate will have five working days to ~~may~~ read and respond in writing to the dean's letter before the dossier moves forward to the University Review Committee. To that end, the candidate must be given timely access to the dean's letter. The candidate's response will be included in the dossier as it moves forward.

3. University-Level Review.

- a. *Appointment and Composition of University Review Committees.* The University Review Committees consider all candidates for promotion and tenure, whatever the outcome of the previous levels of review. University Review Committees will be established to consider candidates from general discipline areas and thus will be organized into area committees such as:

Fine and Applied Arts

Physical Sciences

Humanities
Life Sciences
Professional and Applied Studies

Social and Behavioral Sciences
Health and Clinical Sciences

Each University Review Committee will consist of at least seven tenured professors of the University, nominated by the deans of the University's schools and colleges, and appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Members of these University Review Committees must be active in their disciplines. Each committee will elect a chair from among its members. At any time, individual members of a University Review Committee may reveal their membership on a committee. After evaluations are completed, the University publishes the membership of the University Review Committees.

The head of the PTU that originates the recommendation will decide, in consultation with the candidate and with approval of the dean, which University Review Committee should evaluate the candidate's dossier. A PTU need not route all of its candidates through the same University Review Committee.

- b. *Procedures for University Review Committees.* Consistent with the principle of flow, the University Review Committee considers both positive and negative recommendations from the school/college review committees. In making its recommendation, the University Review Committee will evaluate cases (1) to assess the strength of the substantive evaluation of the candidate made by the PTU and by external assessors in the discipline, thus ensuring that the prior evaluation meets the criteria embodied in these Guidelines, (2) to assure uniformity of standards across the disciplines represented, and (3) to determine whether the school/college committees properly evaluated any claims of procedural error when such error has properly been raised. The purpose of the University Review Committee is to review generally the quality of evidence in the dossier and determine whether the dossier as presented meets institutional standards.

~~Where a University Review Committee concludes that procedural errors exist that have not been properly evaluated or remedied at the lower level of review, the University Review Committee may (1) remand the case to the school/college committee or to the PTU if such error can be corrected within the current promotion/tenure cycle, with instructions concerning how to proceed thereafter, (2) with the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible, or (3) vote positively on the candidate's application if the error was fatal to the candidate's ability to develop a record worthy of promotion and/or tenure. The University Review Committee may also determine that any procedural error was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate's application for tenure, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate's application.~~

Where a University Review Committee concludes that procedural error(s) exist that have not been properly evaluated or remedied at the lower-level of review, the University Review Committee may take one of the following actions:

(1) Remand the case to the PTU or the school/college committee, if such error can be corrected within the current promotion/tenure cycle, with instructions concerning how to proceed thereafter.

(2) Find that the procedural error was fatal to the candidate's ability to achieve a fair evaluation of the record at the lower level(s) of review or a record worthy of promotion and/or tenure. A finding of such fatal procedural error by a 2/3 majority vote of the eligible University Review Committee members will nullify a negative recommendation from the previous level of review. The committee will then vote, based on all available information, including knowledge that a fatal procedural error occurred, on the candidate's application

for promotion and/or tenure. The resulting recommendation of the University Review Committee, based upon a simple majority vote of the participating eligible faculty, will be forwarded to the Provost in place of the nullified vote from the previous level of review. A tie vote is interpreted as a negative vote.

(3) With the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible.

(4) Determine that any procedural error was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate's application.

c. *Voting Procedures for University Review Committees:*

- **Quorum:** Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. Therefore, a quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.
- **Absentions:** No abstentions are allowed.
- **Recusal** – Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier. Faculty from the candidate's PTU will refrain from participating in any form of evaluation at higher levels of review.
- **Absentee Ballots** – No absentee ballots are allowed.
- **Recommendations** - The recommendation before the University Review Committee may be reversed only if a 2/3 majority of the eligible committee members who are present at the meeting vote to reverse the outcome at the lower level. Refer to the above section regarding cases where a University Review Committee concludes that a procedural error exists that has not been properly evaluated or remedied at the lower level of review. ~~For example, if the PTU did not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and if the PTU's unfavorable decision was not reversed by the school/college committee, the University Review Committee may reverse such an unfavorable result only by a 2/3 vote in favor of the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure.~~

~~In voting on a candidate, no members of a University Review Committee may recuse themselves, absent a conflict of interest. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in consideration and discussion of the candidate's dossier.~~

~~A 2/3 majority of eligible voters is necessary for a University Review Committee to overturn the recommendation brought before it for review. For example, if the PTU did not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure, and if the PTU's unfavorable decision was not reversed by the school/college committee, the University Review Committee may reverse such an unfavorable result only by a 2/3 vote in favor of the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure.~~

The University Review Committee will vote by secret ballot and record the total number of yes and no votes. The result of the vote, including the tally, must be reported to the committee before the meeting adjourns. In addition, the committee must record the rationale for its decision to grant or deny the candidate's application for promotion or tenure. All such statements must be in writing and must be transmitted, along with the tally of the vote, to the candidate, who will have the opportunity to respond to the committee's statement within seven working days. Such a statement will be included in the dossier as it moves forward.

The University Review Committees transmit their written recommendations and

accompanying rationale to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. If the recommendation is positive, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will forward the recommendation to the President for official University action. If the recommendation is negative, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will forward the dossier to the University Appeals Committee, ~~with the consent~~ [upon the written request](#) of the candidate, which will evaluate the substance of the case as well as any procedural issues identified by the candidate.

4. Definition of Procedural Errors.

In evaluating cases for promotion and/or tenure, school/college and University Review Committees may consider claims of procedural error. Such claims include:

- Failure to conduct a third-year review or yearly performance evaluations.
- Failure to consult a candidate regarding external evaluations.
- Failure of the PTU to vote in accordance with mandated procedures.
- Failure to evaluate a candidate in accordance with the unit criteria.
- Any other claims regarding failure of the PTU to meet established procedural requirements as mandated by these [Guidelines](#) or unit criteria.

In evaluating such claims, review committees must also consider the candidate's responsibility in the promotion and/or tenure process.

VIII. **APPEALS** [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation from the University Review Committee (either because the University Review Committee fails to overturn a negative recommendation from a school/college committee, or because the University Review Committee overturns a positive lower-level recommendation), the dossier ~~is automatically~~ [will be](#) forwarded to the University Appeals Committee [upon the written request of the candidate](#) ~~unless the candidate chooses to withdraw his/her application in writing.~~ The University Appeals Committee is chaired by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (who is an ex-officio but non-voting member) [and consists of tenured full professors, one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia. The representative from the Graduate School must be a member of the Graduate Council.](#) ~~and consists of 14 professors, one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia, including a tenured professor representing the Graduate Council.~~ Faculty members representing each of the 43 academic schools/colleges will be selected by the University Council through procedures they have developed to constitute faculty committees. The representative from the Graduate Council will be nominated by the Dean of the Graduate School, in consultation with that Council and with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The University Appeals Committee must be constituted by May 1 of every year for the upcoming promotion and/or tenure review cycle.

At the time the dossier is forwarded to the University Appeals Committee, the candidate must be notified of his/her opportunity to further supplement the record. Supplements must be in writing and must be based on one or more of the following allegations of error:

1. Significant procedural irregularities (see Section VII 4) in periodic review and advisement or in the review process at the PTU level.
2. Significant procedural irregularities or inadequacies in the process of review by the school/college or University Review Committees, including the failure to vote in accordance with mandated procedures or to operate in accordance with procedures mandated in these [Guidelines](#).

The responsibility of the candidate (or his/her designee) is to document in writing that the negative recommendation is principally a consequence of one or more of the grounds listed above, and that

therefore the candidate's qualifications did not receive a fair review. **Therefore, no further letters of support can be added to the dossier when the dossier is forwarded to the University Appeals Committee.**

The responsibility of the University Appeals Committee is to make its best judgment as to (1) the existence of material failures, inaccuracies or procedural irregularities; (2) whether or not these failures, inaccuracies or irregularities significantly impaired an appropriate review of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. At its option, the committee may interview the candidate, the PTU head or the dean, as well as any other individuals who are in a position to provide useful information about the review.

Voting Procedures for University Appeals: Faculty from the candidate's PTU will refrain from participating in any form of evaluation at all higher levels of review.

- **Quorum:** Consists of at least two-thirds of the membership.
- **Absentions:** No abstentions are allowed.
- **Recusal** – Only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's dossier.
- **Absentee Ballots** – No absentee ballots are allowed.
- **Recommendations** – A simple majority vote of eligible voting faculty members present at the meeting. A tie vote of eligible voting members present at the meeting is considered a negative recommendation.

~~A quorum for the University Appeals Committee is 2/3 of the membership.~~

By a simple majority vote of eligible voters **present at the meeting**, the University Appeals Committee will advise (with supporting rationale) the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in one of two ways:

1. that there appear to be no material failures, inaccuracies or irregularities or that any failures, inaccuracies or irregularities did not play a significant or controlling role in the negative vote; or
2. that identified failures, inaccuracies or irregularities did exist and may have interfered, or did in fact interfere, with an appropriate vote on the performance record.

~~A tie vote of eligible members is considered a negative recommendation.~~ If the recommendation of the University Appeals Committee is that the grounds for appeal were insufficient to have had an adverse effect on the results of the prior committee's vote, then the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will so inform the candidate, PTU head and dean, and the negative recommendation will stand. If there is a further review, it is made to the President.

If the recommendation of the University Appeals Committee is that the appeal has merit, then the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will take steps designed to address the problem. These may include, but are not limited to, referral to the original committee or formation of an ad hoc committee to make a substantive review and recommendation, a direct recommendation for promotion and/or tenure to the President or consultation with internal or external authorities.

The recommendations of the University Appeals Committee and the steps to be taken by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost should be communicated to the candidate, PTU head and dean within five working days of receipt of the committee's recommendation. When these steps are completed, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will make his/or her judgment and accordingly inform the candidate, PTU head and dean.

Any candidate who wishes to appeal to the Office of the President must do so in writing. The appeal must be made within seven working days of the receipt of the letter from the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, communicating the decision. In any appeal to the President, the candidate must include a copy of the recommendation of the University Appeals Committee. The President's recommendation will be based on a review of the record. There will be no oral presentations by or on behalf of the candidate. Accordingly, it is the responsibility of the candidate to inspect the record to ensure that it is complete.

IX. INSTRUCTORS AND TEMPORARY ASSISTANT PROFESSORS [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Promotion of Instructors Who Have Received the Terminal Degree

Promotion from instructor to assistant professor is subject to the same requirements that govern new appointments at the assistant professor level. The minimum requirement is the terminal degree appropriate for the candidate's academic discipline.

Change of Status of Temporary Assistant Professors

A person who is very close to completing the requirements for the terminal degree may be employed as a temporary assistant professor, provided that all University policies including equal opportunity and affirmative action guidelines are followed. When the person receives the terminal degree, the temporary assistant professor rank may be changed to the assistant professor rank by administrative action. That is, the unit head transmits the appropriate documentation to the dean and the request proceeds accordingly. Board of Regents policy stipulates that time in track as an instructor or temporary assistant professor counts toward tenure.

X. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

A. Definition [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The University grants tenure status to faculty members after a probationary period in the profession to protect faculty from dismissal except for cause. The probationary period is five years, including the year in which a faculty member is being reviewed for tenure. As indicated earlier (see p.18), a request for probationary credit toward tenure is made at the time of appointment.

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

B. Criteria [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Candidates for tenure must have a record of exemplary performance in the discharge of their primary responsibilities in teaching; research or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. In addition, a recommendation for tenure must also address a fundamental consideration: the University's continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do. Tenure review committees are responsible for considering whether or not candidates are likely to continue to be active and productive scholars over the extended period of time that tenure supposes. The decision to grant tenure is one of the most important decisions that faculty members and administrators make as stewards of the institution.

C. Regulations [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured person is to the extent of continued employment on a full-time basis

1. Employment Status.

Only associate professors and professors who are normally employed full-time by the University are eligible to hold tenure. Faculty at the rank of associate professor and professor may be tenured at the time of their appointment to the University, if their established records are exemplary and merit tenure at appointment. This recommendation may be made by the PTU and approved by the dean of the school/college, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and the President, and with the consent of the Board of Regents.

At the University of Georgia, instructors and assistant professors are not eligible for tenure upon appointment. Assistant professors may apply for tenure at the same time they are applying for promotion to associate professor if the minimum years of service for both have been attained, and if the record of accomplishments merits tenure.

Nontenured faculty are employed on a year-to-year basis and may be terminated with timely notice. Faculty with temporary or visiting appointments are not eligible for tenure and are bound by the time limits specified. Persons with adjunct appointments, academic professional appointments, public service appointments, and honorific appointments are not eligible for tenure and are not bound by time limits.

2. Time Limits.

Instructor. Tenure is not awarded at the rank of instructor. A faculty member may serve no more than seven years at the rank of full-time instructor.

Assistant Professor. Tenure is not awarded at the rank of assistant professor, and a faculty member may serve no more than seven years at this rank.

Associate Professor and Professor. A maximum of seven years may be served without the award of tenure when the initial appointment is made at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor. The maximum length of time served is up to 10 years if the initial appointment was made at the instructor level.

If the Board of Regents does not approve an institutional recommendation for tenure following the seventh year (or tenth year for individuals initially appointed as instructors) of full-time employment, the University may offer a terminal contract for one additional year.

3. Probationary Period.

To be eligible for tenure, the candidate must complete a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service, including the year when tenure will be considered at the University level, at the rank of assistant professor or higher. The five-year period must be continuous, except that the University may permit a maximum of two years interruption because of a leave of absence such as family medical leave (including the birth of a child) or part-time service, provided that no probationary credit for the period of an interruption is allowed. Requests for extension of the tenure probationary period due to a family medical event are made in writing to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Guidelines for requesting extension of the tenure probationary period are available on the Provost's web site. Additional information about medical leave may be found on the Division of Human Resources web site.

A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed

for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions, or for service as an instructor at the University of Georgia or prior service in other appropriate professional activities (as defined by the PTU and approved by the dean). The President defines such credit for prior service in writing and the Chancellor approves such credit at the time of the initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor or higher.

Nontenured faculty who are in their sixth probationary year and who have not been turned down for tenure in their fifth year must be reviewed for tenure unless they request not to be reviewed. Upon recommendation of the unit head, the dean and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and with convincing justification, the President may make an exception to the sixth year rule.

A faculty member loses tenure, or probationary credit toward tenure, under certain circumstances: upon resignation from the institution; resignation from a tenured position to take a nontenured position; or resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given to take a position for which no probationary credit toward tenure is given. In the event the faculty member is again employed in a position eligible for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be considered in the same manner as service at another institution, consistent with the Board of Regents Policy on Tenure.

D. Tenure Process [\[return to Table of Contents\]](#)

The procedures for awarding tenure extend over several activities: advising about the tenure process, initiating the tenure process, making recommendations from the tenure units and performing reviews of documentation and the tenure unit's recommendations. Generally, the University should schedule activities so that faculty on academic year appointments can complete the process in time for the President to receive the tenure recommendations by February 1. These procedures, however, do not cover Regents-approved academic administrators who do not have academic tenure when they are appointed as administrators.

1. Initiation of the Tenure Process.

The candidate, PTU head or tenured faculty of the PTU may initiate the tenure process. A faculty member who has served the probationary period may request consideration for tenure and provide evidence to support that request. At such a request, the head of the PTU will convene the tenured faculty who would make the preliminary consideration concerning tenure review. Based upon an updated vita and any other materials deemed relevant by the unit, the unit faculty will decide whether or not to proceed with the tenure process for those faculty who have requested tenure. This consideration should follow the same procedures for preliminary consideration of promotion.

At this point, the tenure review process parallels the process for promotion. A dossier must be prepared for evaluation by the PTU. Preparation and verification of the contents of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the unit head and the faculty member. Appendix C describes the elements required in the dossier.

In accordance with the principle of flow, all recommendations will go forward to the next level of review and ultimately to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The PTU head and the dean must document the University's continuing and long-range need for what the candidate for tenure may be expected to do. This is a critical component of the tenure review process.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in two tenure-granting academic units, then either unit may initiate consideration for tenure and prepare the documentation. The documentation will be made available to the appropriate tenured faculties of the two academic units concerned. The vote of each unit should be recorded in the dossier and provided to the candidate, and forwarded to

the next higher level of review, as described in Section VII. Since tenure resides at the institutional level, a candidate who is recommended for tenure in one unit, but not in a second, may be granted tenure if the record of achievements and need for services merit tenure at the institution.

2. Recommendation by the PTU.

Recommendations for promotion and recommendations for tenure are separate actions and require separate votes. However, the same procedures and materials (dossier) are used for each. These Guidelines specify the procedures. Dossiers for candidates for tenure who are not also candidates for promotion may include past letters of evaluation used for promotion if they have been obtained within the last two years. Otherwise, new letters are required.

3. Reviews.

The same committees at the school/college and University levels that review promotion recommendations also will review recommendations for tenure, using the same PTU criteria, to ensure that the tenure criteria, regulations and procedures have been correctly observed. The tenure review should parallel the promotion review in procedural steps. Each review committee will consider tenure recommendations after it has considered promotion recommendations. Separate votes on each are required.

4. Tenure for Administrative Positions.

Faculty who serve as academic administrators may be tenured in their academic PTU, but are not tenured as administrators per se. Academic administrators are faculty that carry Board of Regents appointments as administrators. Academic administrators may have faculty rank and tenure within PTU affiliations.

Academic administrators chosen from the tenured faculty retain their academic tenure as faculty, but are not tenured as administrators. Academic administrators chosen from nontenured faculty or from outside the University do not have academic tenure.

Tenured faculty will vote on an academic administrator's eligibility for academic tenure in the PTU, preceding his/her appointment. Assuming the candidate's qualifications merit appointment as an associate professor or professor and the vote of the faculty is positive, a tenured faculty appointment may be extended to an administrator, consistent with Board of Regents policy.