

UGA University Council

Faculty Affairs Committee's Proposed Revisions to the

UGA GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE (March 4, 2010)

KEY: ~~Strikethrough~~ = Remove from current *Guidelines* Underline = Add to current *Guidelines*

Third-Year Review (pp. 13 & 25-26)

1. Revise the definition of "third-year review" in the Glossary of the *Guidelines* (p. 13) to make it consistent with the longer discussion in the text. (pp. 25-26)

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 on the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure for continuance of the candidate. This vote is advisory to the PTU head and/or the dean. The letter from the PTU Head to the candidate documenting feedback from the third-year review and any written response from the candidate must be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier at the time of the review.~~

2. Clarify Promotion & Tenure Unit (PTU) Head's voting rights and also the timeline for the candidate's reply. (pp. 25-26)

C. Third-Year Review for Assistant Professors - 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 at the University of Georgia, preliminary consideration for promotion and/or tenure will replace the third-year review. Faculty members undergoing third-year review will prepare their dossiers in collaboration with the PTU Head detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. This dossier should take the form of Sections 4 and 5 of the promotion and tenure dossier (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, including the PTU Head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. The committee will then report its recommendations, along with the vote, to the PTU head. The PTU head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU head's letter, and

any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.

Preliminary Consideration (pp. 26-27)

3. (a) In cases where the candidate cannot go forward because of a negative vote, preliminary consideration is not just advisory to the candidate, so remove text that it is not a formal part of the process. (b) Add headers to Assistant Professor and Associate Professor sections. (c) Also, clarify when the process will proceed for Associate Professors.

E. Preliminary Consideration - In order to receive preliminary consideration for promotion and/or 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. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. 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.

Assistant Professors: If 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.~~

Associate Professors: An associate professor can request preliminary consideration for promotion to professor the first year in which an eligible candidate wishes to be reviewed and in any subsequent year. Regardless of the outcome of the vote for preliminary consideration, the full review will take place the first year the candidate requests it, or if five or more years have transpired since the last unsuccessful full review; otherwise, a full review will not occur following a negative vote for preliminary consideration.

Preparing for Promotion and/or Tenure Unit Evaluation (p. 28, 2nd paragraph)

4. Clarify that there can be no contact between eligible voting faculty in the PTU and individuals on the candidate's external evaluator no -contact list:

.....The candidate also constructs a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators, and the head of the promotion/tenure unit and other eligible voting faculty in the unit may not contact these individuals about the candidate's promotion and/or tenure review. ~~There should be no contact at all with these individuals during the promotion and/or tenure review~~

Promotion/Tenure-Unit Review (p. 30)

5. Allow PTU head to provide a rationale for a negative PTU vote, regardless of how the PTU head voted. (p. 30)

Unless the PTU head voted against the candidate, the dossier goes forward with a cover letter from the PTU head (or his/her designee). In the event that the PTU vote was negative, the PTU head, regardless of his/her vote, will summarize the deliberation for the PTU's negative vote as a separate document in the dossier. The candidate will have five working days to read and respond in writing to any cover letter and/or rationale before it goes forward.

External Letters of Evaluation (p. 28 & p. 48)

6. Appendix D should be a letter template for external evaluation requests, not a sample letter. That template should be used, and information can be added as appropriate. (see p. 28)

Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors and personal friends. Appendix C describes this process more fully, and Appendix D provides a letter template ~~sample form~~ for requesting external letters of evaluation. The PTU head may add clarifying information to the letter of request as appropriate.

Appendix D: Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

7. Change the title of the Appendix from "Sample Letter" to "Letter Template." Also include statement that the PTU head can add clarifying information to the letter template. (p. 48)

Appendix D —~~Sample Letter~~ Template for Requesting Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

This letter template should be used for all requests for external evaluations for promotion and/or tenure. The PTU head may add clarifying information to the letter of request as appropriate.

8. Add "creative" and "artistic" contributions to sentence in the first paragraph of the letter template. (p. 48)

.....Instead we seek your professional judgment of the impact and quality of X's scholarly and creative contributions (PTU Head: include "creative" and/or "artistic" as appropriate).

Appendix C: Outline – Dossier for Promotion and/or Tenure (pp. 45-47)

9. Clarify introductory paragraph what is covered in page number limit and that no appendices are allowed for university-level review

The purpose of the dossier is to present evidence of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. It should be prepared in a concise matter. ~~The vita and achievements sections~~ Sections 4 and 5 together should not exceed 25 pages. ~~Include only summaries in the dossier.~~ Appendices are not part of the formal dossier at the university-level review and should be available only upon request. The contents and organization of the dossier are described below.

10. *Section 7: External Evaluations* –Change sample letter to letter template and clarify the information included in the "Statement of Qualifications", including identification of evaluators from candidate's vs PTU's list (p. 47)

Obtain at least four from authorities outside the University who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. ~~Briefly state the qualifications for each person evaluating the candidate.~~ Provide the external evaluator with the candidate's vita and examples of the candidate's best scholarly works. Obtain letters from individuals who know the candidate professionally (preferably through his/her publications, presentations, artistic creations or performances) and who are able to judge the candidate's reputation and relative status in the field. Do not solicit letters from the candidate's former major professor, former students, close associates or friends. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and quality of scholastic achievements; do not solicit supporting letters or personal references. Do not contact anyone the candidate has declared a nonevaluator. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's dossier promotion file. Appendix D presents a ~~sample letter~~ template for ~~format~~ requesting an external evaluation ~~recommendation~~.

The following information must also be included in Section 7 of the dossier: 1) Identification of which letters are from the candidate's list of evaluators and which letters are from the PTU's list of evaluators; and 2) A brief statement of the qualifications of each person evaluating the candidate.