

Feb. 15, 2017

Dear Executive Committee,

The Faculty Affairs Committee submits the following proposed revisions to the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*, approved by unanimous electronic vote of our committee on Feb. 13-15, 2017, for approval by the University Council. Following is a summary of the changes (excluding purely grammatical or typographical changes). I have tried to distinguish changes that clarify language or procedures from substantive changes to procedure.

I submit no separate clean copy, only a PDF version of the same Word document with "Markup" unchecked. Before printing this revision, the Provost's office will copyedit the manuscript, fix problems of pagination, and update the index. Some typographical errors and layout problems may therefore remain in this draft but will be addressed before printing.

1. The Guidelines are now called *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty* to reflect that it does not address procedures for faculty of non-Academic Rank. Those documents are being updated separately.
2. The non-discrimination statement has been updated to reflect current NDAH policy.
3. A definition of Academic Rank Faculty has been added to the Glossary.
4. In the Glossary, criteria for the rank of Instructor and rules about credit toward tenure and the maximum probationary period for an instructor promoted to assistant professor have been changed. The changes reflect BOR policy.
5. Language about how candidates should document co-authored research has been clarified but not substantively changed (III.B.1)
6. Language about how to document grant awards has been clarified and changed slightly (III.B.5).
7. Language about how department heads should justify the appointment or promotion/tenure of candidates without terminal degrees in their discipline has been clarified but not substantively changed (IV Introduction).
8. Language about when a promotion is considered early has been simplified and there is a substantive change. Promotion to any rank is now considered early if the candidate, at the time of review, is not serving in the fifth year of the previous rank. Formerly, promotion to associate professor from assistant professor was "early" if the candidate was not serving in at least her/his fourth year as assistant professor. (IV Introduction).
9. Heads must request credit toward the probationary period at the time the offer letter is written or, in any case, before appointment (IV Introduction).
10. Section IV on "Requirements" no longer includes exceptions to the rule that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor must "demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields." Formerly, exceptions were allowed for candidates whose appointments were at the regional, state, or local level.

11. In section 6.C, third-year reviews must be conducted for untenured associate and full professors, per Regents' policy, and not only for assistant professors. This change is only relevant to departments with untenured associate or full professors.
12. Some procedures for Preliminary Consideration, 6.E, have been substantively changed.
 - A. A quorum of 2/3 of faculty eligible to vote must be present. Absentee ballots may be recorded but do not count toward the quorum.
 - B. The language that describes what the vote is about has been changed. In the revision, eligible faculty "vote on whether they believe the candidate has met the requirements for promotion/tenure and is likely to succeed in the review the following fall semester."
 - C. Language about procedures following a negative preliminary vote for promotion in the case of untenured faculty has been clarified but there is no substantive change. Untenured candidates who wish to delay review for tenure to their seventh year must request permission from the Provost *by May of their fifth year in rank*.
 - D. We have tried to clarify language about procedures for associate professors whose preliminary vote for promotion to full professor was negative. However, the language still may be hard to understand because we did not change the rule that places limits on consecutive tries for full review after a negative preliminary vote.
 - E. We did change the number of years that a candidate must wait to pursue a full review after a negative preliminary vote from five to three. As always, a candidate who receives a positive preliminary vote and is otherwise qualified may proceed to full review.
13. In section VII A, Procedures for Promotion, changes were made to the procedures for seeking external review letters, and some material was moved from Appendix C to this section. Language was clarified, and substantive changes are the following:
 - F. External reviewers should hold a rank equal to, or higher than, the rank to which a candidate is seeking appointment. Heads must otherwise provide justification for using the reviewer.
 - G. For external reviewers outside the United States, Heads should describe their equivalent rank in the United States academic system.
 - H. Language about the number of letters required has been changed. The minimum number of required letters is still four, but language about the preferred number of letters has been removed.
 - I. Candidates should supply a list of up to four preferred reviewers (formerly six). This is intended to make the review process easier by allowing a larger pool from which the PTU Head may choose a non-overlapping list.
 - J. The PTU head should notify the candidate in writing when all letters have been received.
14. In section VII, "Appeals," language about the charge to the appeals committee has been clarified to be more neutral, but it does not represent a substantive change to the committee's charge.
15. The short Section IX, "Instructors and Limited Term Assistant Professors," has been changed to "Limited Term Assistant Professors." The paragraph about promotion of

instructors here has been deleted, because the Guidelines do not offer detailed instruction for the rare case of promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor. The corresponding entry in the Table of Contents has also been changed.

16. A paragraph has been deleted from section X.C, Procedures for Tenure: Regulations, because it is redundant with the instructions about approval for review in the seventh probationary year in section 6.E (see item 12.C above).
17. In Appendix C: Dossier for Promotion and Tenure, style guidelines have been added.
18. In Appendix C, the chair's cover letter must include discussion of how the candidate meets PTU criteria for promotion and tenure.
19. In Appendix C, information on external evaluators must include a justification for the selection of any external evaluators who do not hold a rank equal to, or higher than, the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion; and an explanation of the equivalent rank in the US academic system for any evaluators who work outside the US.
20. Appendix D (Letter Template Requesting Evaluation): Clarifies that the chair should not disclose the results of the department's preliminary vote to potential evaluators.
21. Appendix E (Cover Letter for Tenure): Clarifies that chairs producing a single letter for promotion and tenure must include all items requested in Appendices E and F.
22. Appendix E: Chair's cover letters for tenure should include discussion of how the candidate meets PTU criteria.
23. Appendix E: A new section requires that chairs directly address any negative external evaluations and explain the PTU's rationale in enough detail that higher-level committees can understand the full context of the PTU's decision.
24. Appendix F: Cover Letter for Promotion. Contains the same changes as Appendix E.
25. Appendix G: Electronic Dossier Checklist. Style guidelines have been added.
26. Appendix H: Recommended Vita Format is new.

Thank you and best wishes,

Susan Mattern
Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Guidelines for
**Appointment,
Promotion and Tenure**



of Academic Rank Faculty

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Approved by the University Council
April 22, 2004

Edited April 29, 2004

Revised by the University Council
Spring, 2006
Fall, 2007
Spring, 2010, 2011
Fall 2011
Spring 2013, 2014
Spring 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction to the Guidelines.....7

II. Glossary..... 10

III. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure.....13

 A. Contributions to Teaching

 B. Contributions to Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activities

 C. Contributions in Service to Society, the University and the Profession

IV. Requirements for Ranks.....21

V. Procedures for Appointments.....23

VI. Promotion and Tenure Unit.....24

 A. Advisement about Promotion and Tenure

 B. Annual Evaluation

 C. Third-year Review for Untenured Faculty

 D. Renewal of Non-Tenured Faculty

 E. Preliminary Consideration

VII. Procedures for Promotion27

 A. Preparing for Promotion and/or Tenure-Unit Evaluation

 B. Reviews

VIII. Appeals.....37

IX. Limited Term Assistant Professors.....39

X. Procedures for Tenure39

 A. Definition

 B. Criteria

 C. Regulations

 D. Tenure Process

XI. Appendices44

 Appendix A: Appointment Package Outline

 Appendix B: Sample Letter Requesting a Reference

 Appendix C: Outline – Dossier for Promotion and/or Tenure

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

 Appendix E: Outline – Cover Letter for Tenure

 Appendix F: Outline – Cover Letter for Promotion

 Appendix G: Promotion and/or Tenure Dossier Checklist

 Appendix H: Recommended Vita Format

**Members of the Task Force on
Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
2003-2004**

Michael L. Wells (Chair)	<i>School of Law</i>
Alison F. Alexander	<i>College of Journalism and Mass Communication</i>
William E. Barstow	<i>College of Arts and Sciences/Biological Sciences</i>
Jonathon D. Crystal	<i>College of Arts and Sciences/Psychology</i>
William D. Davis	<i>College of Arts and Sciences/School of Music</i>
Cheryl D. Dozier	<i>University of Georgia at Gwinnett</i>
Robert E. Hoyt	<i>Terry College of Business</i>
Patricia L. Kalivoda	<i>Office of the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach</i>
Charles H. Keith	<i>College of Arts and Sciences/Cellular Biology</i>
Stefanie A. Lindquist	<i>School of Public and International Affairs</i>
James N. Moore	<i>College of Veterinary Medicine</i>
David H. Newman	<i>School of Forest Resources</i>
Susan C. Quinlan	<i>College of Arts and Sciences/Romance Languages</i>
Mark E. Reinberger	<i>College of Environment and Design</i>
Randall L. Tackett	<i>College of Pharmacy</i>
Patricia S. Wilson	<i>College of Education/Department of Mathematics Education</i>
Bonnie L. Yegidis	<i>Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost</i>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The ad-hoc task force appointed in August 2003 by Provost Arnett Mace to provide revisions to the 1995 University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment Promotion and Tenure is indebted to the guidance and labor of several former senior administrators, to several task forces and committees who have revised this document at stages and to the input of most of the faculty members at the University of Georgia. Without their work, this document would have presented a daunting task. We gratefully acknowledge them.

These Guidelines provide a synthesis of all previous work in order to present a document that offers a holistic approach to the continuing development and retention of exemplary faculty members as they engage in teaching, research and service at the University of Georgia. Participatory faculty governance is essential to the quality of academic life at this University.

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES

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 of Academic Rank Faculty (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 for assistant professors 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, gender identity, sexual orientation, ethnicity or national origin, religion, age, genetic information, veteran status or disability. Policy statements governing affirmative action / equal opportunity may be reviewed at: <http://www.uga.edu/eoo>

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

Academic Rank Faculty – Per the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' Policy Manual, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are awarded academic rank.

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 appointment or a fair and objective review of a request for promotion and/or tenure must recuse himself/herself from participation in the recommendation/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% work- load during either an academic or fiscal-year contract.

Instructor – the rank of instructor is an entry-level position for the University. Candidates must have a master’s degree in the teaching discipline or a master’s degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline). Individuals in this rank are not eligible for tenure. If an instructor at UGA is hired as an assistant professor, a maximum of three (3) years’ credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed, per BOR policy (8.3.7.4). The maximum time that may be served at UGA in a combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be ten (10) years (BOR policy 8.3.7.6). A faculty member may serve no more than seven years at the rank of full-time instructor.

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 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.

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.

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-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 posi-

14 guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure
tions 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 – 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. 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.

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 tenured full professors,
one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia. The represen-
tative from the Graduate School must be a member of 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, orga-
nized 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 recommenda-
tions 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.

Years in Rank – the time a tenure-track faculty member has served in a particular posi-
tion. 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 mem-
bers 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

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 profes-
sion. Academic appointment, promotion and tenure are based upon a candidate's perfor-
mance 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

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, Scholarship and Other Creative Activities

The Standard

Research, scholarship 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, scholarship 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, scholarship or other creative activities includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. For joint endeavors, the candidate should indicate the extent of their contribution. .

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 total amount awarded and amount awarded to candidate, if different) 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

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

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. Exceptions to the terminal degree requirement 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. For promotion candidates who have not earned the appropriate terminal degree in their respective disciplines, the PTU Head's cover letter should summarize the justification provided to the Provost at the time of hire for hiring this candidate without a terminal degree.

Under special circumstances, faculty who are performing significantly above the expectations for their current rank may be considered for "early" promotion. Strong justification **in the PTU Head's cover letter** is required for any recommendation for early promotion. A promotion is considered early if the candidate will have completed fewer than **five** years in rank at the University of Georgia.

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 for **promotion and tenure**. A maximum of three years probationary credit may be granted for this service. **Probationary credit must be expressly requested at the time the offer letter is written, or prior to appointment, and must be approved by the President or his/her delegate.**

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

guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure 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 **five** 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 per the criteria listed in part III, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, of this document, and the criteria established by their PTU.

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, the per criteria listed in part III, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, of this document, and the criteria established by their PTU. They should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

V. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS

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) has the option to 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 and the President for final approval. Note that appointments to endowed chairs and professorships require Board of Regents' final approval.

VI. PROMOTION AND TENURE UNIT

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

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, scholarship 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.

B. Annual Evaluation

Every instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and 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.

C. Third-Year Review for Untenured Faculty

The third-year review, a formative process, occurs at the end of the third year of appointment for untenured assistant professors, associate professors or professors. If a faculty member comes to the University of Georgia with 2 or 3 years of prior credit towards promotion and/or tenure and requests to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the third year of appointment at the University of Georgia, preliminary consideration for promotion and/or tenure will replace the third-year review. Faculty members undergoing third-year review will prepare their dossiers in collaboration with the PTU Head detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. This dossier should take the form of Sections 4 and 5 of the promotion and tenure dossier (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. A quorum (two-thirds of the tenured faculty) should

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.

D. Renewal of Non-Tenured Faculty

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. Timely notice must be given to the faculty member per University of Georgia and Board of Regents Policies on Notice of Employment.

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 and/or tenure review process would occur. Each year, the PTU head will convene the unit faculty eligible to vote so they may consider those individuals who are being evaluated for promotion and tenure. A quorum (2/3 of the eligible faculty) is required; absentee ballots do not count towards quorum. Based on an updated vita and other materials deemed relevant by the unit, the eligible faculty will vote on whether they believe the candidate has met the requirements for promotion/tenure and is likely to succeed in the review the following fall semester. The unit head is responsible for informing the candidate within three business days of the vote of the unit's recommendation. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. The outcome of the vote for preliminary consideration will not appear in the dossier.

Nontenured Professors: Following the preliminary consideration vote, the candidate may decide whether to proceed with the full review or not. Nontenured faculty who have not been turned down for tenure in their fifth year must be reviewed for tenure in their sixth probationary year, unless they request in writing not to be reviewed. Requests to delay review until the seventh year may be approved by the President, upon recommendation of the unit head, the dean and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, with convincing justification. Such requests should be submitted to the Provost, via the Office of Faculty Affairs, by May of the fifth year in rank.

Tenured Associate Professors: Candidates for promotion to full professor may request preliminary consideration at the end of their 4th year in rank, or in any year after that. If their initial preliminary vote is negative, in keeping with the principle of flow, the process

28 guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure of review may continue, unless the candidate chooses to withdraw. If a candidate for professor is not successfully promoted, the candidate will not be eligible for review after a negative preliminary vote until three years have transpired since the last negative review. (This exception to the principle of flow is intended to reduce the burden on external evaluators and review committees, which would result from reviewing the same candidate year after year.) However, if a candidate's preliminary vote is positive within the three year period following an unsuccessful promotion application, the candidate may apply for promotion the following fall.

VII. PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

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 with prior approval to delay review until the seventh year (see Section VI.E.), 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 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

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 7 (External Evaluations) of the dossier need to be included, unless the PTU's own procedures require the entire dossier. Sections 1 (Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure Forms) 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 letters on the quality of the candidate's contributions from persons highly qualified to provide an assessment. These external letters should come from authorities outside the University who are nationally recognized in their field and who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. They should be individuals who know the candidate professionally, preferably through his/her publications, presentations, artistic creations and performances and who are able to judge the candidate's reputation and relative status in the field. External reviewers should hold an equal or higher rank than the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion. For external reviewer outside the United States or in non-academic positions, the "statement of qualifications" (see below) should address the question of the reviewer's equivalent rank in the U.S. academic system. Assessments should not be sought from terminal degree advisors, postdoctoral advisors, former students, close associates, or personal friends. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and the quality of their scholastic achievements; do not solicit supporting letters or personal references. Appendix D provides a letter template for requesting external letters of evaluation. The PTU head may add clarifying information to the letter of request as appropriate.

A minimum of 4 appraisal letters will be obtained from external reviewers. The candidate will construct a list of up to four potential external evaluators and provide information on their qualifications as reviewers to the PTU Head. At least two of the external letters in the dossier must be from the candidate's list and at least two must be from a list generated by the PTU Head that excludes reviewers on the candidate's list. The candidate will also construct a list of no more than three individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. 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. 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 Section 7 of the dossier, along with the following information:

1. Identification of which letters are from the candidate's list of evaluators and which letters are from the PTU's list of reviewers, and
2. A brief statement of qualifications for each person evaluating the candidate

The PTU head will notify the candidate in writing when all external letters have been received. All letters and external reviewers' names are confidential and should not be viewed by the candidate. The University of Georgia will use these letters only in the promotion and/or tenure process. However, these letters may be subject to release under Georgia law.

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 responsibil-

B. Reviews

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. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.
- *Abstentions* - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.
- *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 must 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. Absentee ballots with no vote or not clearly marked are not eligible and will be discarded.
- *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.

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 (UGA Promotion & Tenure Recommendation Forms) 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). Outlines for tenure and promotion cover letters are presented in Appendices E and F. 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. 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.

No revision/alteration of existing documents in the dossier are allowed after the PTU vote has been taken. Any factual errors must be corrected via cover letter or candidate's response as the dossier moves forward to the next level of review. The candidate may add evidence of award of a grant, acceptance of a publication, or other significant achievement to the dossier at any time during the review process. This documentation should be accompanied by a letter of request to add to the dossier and will be included in the cover letter section.

Joint Academic Appointments: If a faculty member has a joint academic appointment with one or more promotion- and tenure-granting units, then either unit may initiate consideration for promotion and prepare the documentation. The appropriate documentation will be made available to the appropriate faculties of the joint academic appointment units concerned. The vote of each unit should be recorded in the dossier and provided to the candidate consistent with these Guidelines. As with all other promotion reviews, the

30 guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure candidate's dossier will move to the next higher level review committee regardless of whether the recommendation at a lower level was positive or negative. A 2/3 majority vote is required to reverse the outcome at the lower levels when a committee receives only positive or only negative recommendations from the prior levels of review. If a school/college review committee or the University Review Committee receives conflicting positive and negative recommendations from the prior levels of review, the recommendation is interpreted as a negative vote for promotion and requires a 2/3 majority of the eligible voters to reverse the outcome. Any questions about the promotion process for joint academic appointments should be directed to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

****Four Possible Scenarios Where Committee Could Receive Conflicting +/- Recommendations**

1) PTUs in Same School/College		
PTU 1	**School/College Committee	University Review Committee
PTU 2		
2) PTUs in Different Schools/Colleges		
PTU 1	School/College Committee 1	**University Review Committee
PTU 2	School/College Committee 2	
3) One PTU is a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1	School/College Committee	**University Review Committee
PTU 2		
4) Both PTUs are a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1	School/College Committee	**University Review Committee
PTU 2		

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 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 committee review, the committee will review the

guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure 31
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. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.
 - *Abstentions* - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.
 - *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.

- d. *Additional Procedures for School/College Review Committees.* 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.
- f. *Role of the Dean.* 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 his/her 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 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	Social and Behavioral Sciences
Life Sciences	Health and Clinical Sciences
Professional and Applied Studies	

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 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. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.
- *Abstentions* - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.
- *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.

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 final approval. If the recommendation is negative, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost will forward the dossier to the University Appeals Committee, 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

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 forwarded to the University Appeals Committee 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. Faculty members representing each of the 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. State that a quorum was present in the cover letter.
- *Abstentions* - No abstentions are allowed. Once a quorum is declared, all members in attendance must vote. Any ballot not clearly marked approve or deny will be considered a "NO" vote.
- *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.

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 on the following:

1. Whether or not material failures, inaccuracies or irregularities existed for a given candidate; and if so
2. Whether or not these failures, inaccuracies or irregularities appear to have interfered with an appropriate vote on the performance record.

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. LIMITED TERM ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

Change of Status of Limited Term Assistant Professors

A person who is very close to completing the requirements for the terminal degree may be employed as a limited term assistant professor (previously titled 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 limited term 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. In such cases, time in rank as a limited term assistant professor counts toward tenure.

X. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE

A. Definition

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. 22), 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

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

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 are eligible to hold tenure. Normally only faculty who are employed full-time (as defined by Regents' policies) by an institution are eligible for 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 upon 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. Each such recommendation of tenure upon appointment shall be granted only in cases in which the faculty at minimum is appointed as an associate or full professor, was already tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution (BOR Minutes, 1983-84, 1996, 2000).

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 President does not receive and 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). Such credit for prior service shall be approved in writing by the President at the time of the initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor or higher.

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

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 a date in January to be determined annually by the Office of Faculty Affairs. These procedures, however, do not cover 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 (see p. 26-27).

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.

Joint Academic Appointments: If a faculty member has a joint academic appointment with one or more promotion- and tenure-granting units, then either unit may initiate consideration for tenure and prepare the documentation. The appropriate documentation will be made available to the appropriate faculties of the joint academic appointment units concerned. The vote of each unit should be recorded in the dossier and provided to the candidate consistent with these Guidelines. As with all other tenure reviews, the candidate's dossier will move to the next higher level review committee regardless of whether the recommendation at a lower level was positive or negative. A 2/3 majority vote is required to reverse the outcome at the lower levels when a committee receives only positive or only negative recommendations from the prior levels of review. If a school/college review committee or the University Review Committee receives conflicting positive and negative recommendations from the prior levels of review, the recommendation is interpreted as a negative vote for tenure and requires a 2/3 majority of the eligible voters to reverse the outcome. Any questions about the tenure process for joint academic appointments should be directed to the Office of Faculty Affairs.

****Four Possible Scenarios Where Committee Could Receive Conflicting +/- Recommendations**

1) PTUs in Same School/College		
PTU 1	**School/College Committee	University Review Committee
PTU 2		
2) PTUs in Different Schools/Colleges		
PTU 1	School/College Committee 1	**University Review Committee
PTU 2	School/College Committee 2	
3) One PTU is a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1	School/College Committee	**University Review Committee
PTU 2		
4) Both PTUs are a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1		**University Review Committee
PTU 2		

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.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Appointment Package Outline

Use to document the candidate's qualifications for appointment as clearly as possible. Present sufficient evidence in a concise fashion. The contents of the package and the way to organize them are described below.

Section 1: Cover Letter

In the cover letter, summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's appointment.

A. Background

Give the purpose of the appointment in relation to departmental and University needs. List the duties the candidate is expected to fulfill, including the percentage of time assigned to teaching, research and/or service. Give the vote of the faculty participating in the recommendation. List the total number of yes and no votes of the participating faculty.

B. Generalizations about the Candidate's Achievements

Make generalizations about the candidate's accomplishments or potential in (1) instruction, (2) research or other creative activities, and (3) service to society, the University and the profession.

C. Assessment of the Candidate's Stature

Make generalizations about the candidate's regional, national or international stature (if appropriate) among those of his/her specialty and time within the discipline.

D. Search Procedures

Describe the method and the extent of the search made for the candidate.

Section 2: Vita

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

Section 3: Letters of Reference

Obtain at least three letters of reference from external authorities who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's appointment file. Include the names, qualifications and institutional affiliations of individuals solicited. A sample letter requesting evaluation is presented in Appendix B. E-mail correspondence may substitute for a letter, but a written letter is requested for follow-up.

Section 4: Appointment Materials

The University of Georgia requires an appointment package of materials to create a faculty appointment. These materials include an appointment form, curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, official transcripts and appropriate personnel, employment and budget forms. A complete list of required documentation is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. Individuals responsible for making faculty appointments should check with the Office of Faculty Affairs to ensure that all materials are properly completed and submitted prior to appointment.

Appendix B: Sample Letter Requesting a Reference

Dear YYYYYY:

The University of Georgia is considering the appointment of Dr. X to the rank of Z. On such appointments we seek expert advice from outside our faculty as well as within. You have been recommended to us as particularly able to evaluate X's qualifications for this position. We would appreciate your candid opinion of the candidate's qualifications and any other information you can provide that will help us in making a wise recommendation. We are especially interested in the following:

1. The quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications (artistic productions/performances).
2. Candidate's reputation and relative standing in (his/her) field.
3. Candidate's general potential for scholarly achievement.

We will make every effort to maintain confidentiality of your review. However, these letters may be subject to release under Georgia law. Your reply will be employed only in the appointment process. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Appendix C: Outline – Dossier for Promotion and/or Tenure

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 manner. Sections 4 and 5 together should not exceed 25 pages; font size must be at least 11 point, all margins must be at least one inch, line spacing must not exceed six lines of text per vertical inch, and page size must be letter (8.5 inches X 11 inches). 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.

Section 1: UGA Recommendation for Promotion and Tenure Forms

Include items A and/or B as appropriate to the purpose(s) of the dossier.

- A. UGA Recommendation for Promotion Form. This one-page form is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. An original copy with signatures and votes must be included in the dossier.
- B. UGA Recommendation for Tenure Form. This one-page form is available on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. An original copy with signatures and votes must be included in the dossier.

Section 2: Cover Letter(s)

Include items A, B, and/or C as appropriate to the purpose(s) of the dossier.

- A. Cover Letter for Promotion. Promotion dossiers include the Cover Letter from the department head, and the dean (or his/her designee). Follow the outline presented in Appendix F.
- B. Cover Letter for Tenure. Tenure dossiers include the Cover Letter for Tenure from the department head and the dean (or his/her designee). Follow the outline presented in Appendix E.
- C. School / College Committee Written Rationale and Vote (as transmitted to the candidate).

Section 3: Unit Criteria

Please include a copy of the approved criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Section 4: Vita

Summarize the candidate's professional activities and attainments described in these Guidelines, and criteria developed by the appointment unit. The candidate should add to the end of the vita a letter no longer than two pages that describes the candidate's major accomplishments and assesses the impact of each. The recommended vita format is presented in Appendix H.

Section 5: Achievements

Describe and document the candidate's achievements in relation to the criteria in these Guidelines in twelve pages or less. Include data and information summaries where appropriate. Achievements sufficiently documented in "Section 4: Vita" are preferably referenced by page number rather than duplicated in Section 5. In addition, the dossier of candidates recom-

mended for professor must document the impact of the individual's work through, for example, evidence of critical response, adoption of technology by the discipline area or citations.

A. Achievements in Teaching

Describe the candidate's work assignments for instruction since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank, including the percent of time assigned to teaching, the courses taught and their enrollments and the use of innovations in the delivery of instruction. Then document the candidate's achievements by presenting pertinent sources of evidence as listed in these Guidelines.

B. Achievements in Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activities

Describe the candidate's work assignments for research, scholarship or other creative activities since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank, and including the percent of time assigned to research. Then document the candidate's achievements by presenting pertinent sources of evidence as listed in these Guidelines.

C. Achievements in Service to Society, the University and the Profession

Describe the candidate's work assignments in service to society, the University and the profession, since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank, and including the percent of time assigned to service. Then document the candidate's achievements by presenting pertinent sources of evidence as listed in these Guidelines.

Section 6: Conditions of Employment and Third Year Review

For all individuals being recommended for promotion and/or tenure, include a copy of the letter of original offer of appointment that specifies the major area of assignment of the position as offered. If there have been PTU-approved changes in those responsibilities, the PTU head should include a brief statement describing the changes and their rationale. In addition, a copy of the third year review must be included in the dossier for assistant professors.

Section 7: External Evaluations

Obtain at least four external letters from authorities outside the University who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. Detailed instructions on who may serve as an evaluator are presented in section VII.A. Provide the external evaluator with the candidate's vita and examples of the candidate's best scholarly works. Do not contact anyone the candidate has declared a non-evaluator and do not disclose the results of the preliminary vote to the external evaluator. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's dossier. Appendix D presents a letter template for requesting an external evaluation.

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. For evaluators outside the United States or in non-academic positions, this statement should explain the reviewer's equivalent rank in the U.S. academic system.
3. A justification for any external reviewers who do not hold a rank equal to or higher than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion

Appendix D: 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, but should not include the outcome of the preliminary vote.

Dear YYYYYY:

The University of Georgia is considering the promotion and/or tenure of Dr. X to the rank of Z.

To aid us in rendering a wise promotion and/or tenure recommendation, we seek a thoughtful evaluation of the candidate's contributions to the field. You have been recommended to us as a person who is in a position to evaluate the scholarly contributions made by X. We do not ask for your judgment about the candidate as a person. 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). Specifically, we are interested in the following:

1. Length and nature of relationship with the candidate.
2. Your judgment of the quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications (artistic productions/performances). The judgment should be specific to particular works, or sets of works. (Option added: Enclosed find work examples [reprints, books or other productions] upon which we would particularly value your professional judgment.)
3. The candidate's professional reputation and standing as a scholar relative to outstanding people in the same field at approximately the same stage of development.

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

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Appendix E: Outline – Cover Letter for Tenure

In the cover letter, summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's readiness for tenure. Include the information specified below. The cover letter will be the principal letter of evaluation from the tenure unit's faculty. If the PTU Head or Dean chooses to write a single cover letter for a candidate applying for promotion and tenure at the same time, the letter must address all content areas specified in Appendices E and F.

A. Background

List the candidate's work assignments since appointment or since promotion to associate professor giving the proportions of time allocated for instruction; research or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. State that a quorum was present and list the total number of yes and no votes of the participating faculty.

B. Probation

Specify the number of years of full-time service the candidate has completed. Specify how much, if any, credit toward the minimum probationary period the candidate has been granted for service elsewhere or for service at the rank of instructor at the University of Georgia.

C. Qualifications and Record of Exemplary Performance

Make generalizations about the candidate's qualifications for the academic rank he/she is to be tenured in and the specific duties he/she is assigned to do. Make generalizations about the exemplary nature of the candidate's record in (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship or other creative activities, and (3) service to society, the University and the profession, and clarify how the candidate has met the PTU criteria.

D. Need for Services

Demonstrate a continuing and long-range need for the candidate. Show how the duties assigned to the candidate are essential to the unit fulfilling its mission at present and in the future.

E. If there was a disparity between the PTU faculty recommendation and the opinion expressed in any of the external review letters, the PTU head must

guidelines for appointment, promotion and tenure 51
record the rationale for the PTU Faculty's decision. The explanation should document why a negative external letter was discounted or why greater weight was given to the more positive external assessments of the candidate. PTU heads are encouraged to go into as much detail as they believe is necessary to provide additional context for higher-level committees to understand the PTU's rationale for the subsequent decision.

Appendix F: Outline – Cover Letter for Promotion

In the cover letter, summarize the evidence supporting the candidate's promotion. Include the information specified below. The cover letter will be the principal letter of evaluation from the PTU's faculty. If the PTU Head or Dean chooses to write a single cover letter for a candidate applying for promotion and tenure at the same time, the letter must address all content areas specified in Appendices E and F.

A. Background

List the candidate's work assignments since appointment or promotion to the presently held rank, giving the proportions of time assigned for teaching; research, scholarship or other creative activities; service to society, the University and the profession. State that a quorum was present and give the vote of the faculty participating in the recommendation. List the total number of yes and no votes of the participating faculty.

B. Generalizations about the Candidate's Achievements

Make generalizations about the candidate's professional accomplishments in instruction; research or other creative, scholarly activities; and service to society, the University and the profession. Anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages of the dossier where the evidence is presented. Explain how the candidate has met the PTU criteria.

C. Assessment of the Candidate's Stature

Make generalizations about the candidate's regional, national or international stature among those of his/her specialty and time within the discipline. Again, anchor these generalizations with cross-references to the pages in the dossier and the exhibits where the evidence is presented.

D. If there was a disparity between the PTU faculty recommendation and the opinion expressed in any of the external review letters, the PTU head must record the rationale for the PTU Faculty's decision. The explanation should document why a negative external letter was discounted or why greater weight was given to the more positive external assessments of the candidate. PTU heads are encouraged to go into as much detail as they believe is necessary to provide additional context for higher-level committees to understand the PTU's rationale for the subsequent decision.

Appendix G: Promotion and/or Tenure Electronic Dossier Checklist

Name _____ Current Rank _____

Department _____ School/College _____

Recommendation For: (check one) Promotion & Tenure Promotion Only Tenure Only

Promotion to: (check one) Assistant Professor Associate Professor Professor
 Clinical Associate Professor Clinical Professor

Contract Type: (check one) Fiscal Academic Adjunct (not paid)

AREA COMMITTEE: (check one) Fine/Applied Arts Health/Clinical Sciences Humanities Life Sciences
 Physical Sciences Social/Behavioral Sciences Professional/Applied Studies

Items in Dossier* (ensure all items are included in the electronic dossier (pdf format) at each level of review)

	✓
(1) Letter of Transmittal (include area committee assignment)	
(2) Table of Contents	
(3) Section I: UGA Recommendation for Promotion Form (with all signatures & votes)	
UGA Recommendation for Tenure Form (with all signatures & votes)	
(4) Section II: PTU Head Cover Letter(s) (Separate cover ltrs for tenure & promotion)	
Dean's Cover Letter(s) (Separate cover ltrs for tenure & promotion)	
School/College Review Committee Written Rational and Vote	
Candidate's Letter(s) of Response (as applicable)	
(5) Section III: Unit Criteria	
(6) Section IV*: Vita	
Candidate's Statement of "Major Accomplishments" (two page max)	
(7) Section V*: Achievements (12 pages or less) 1. Teaching, 2. Research, Scholarship & Other Creative Activities 3. Service to Society, the University & the Profession	
(8) Section VI: Letter of Offer (include statement of any approved changes in assignment & MOU if joint appt)	
Third-Year Review (for promotion to ASOP Only)	
(9) Section VII: Brief Statement of Qualifications of Each External Evaluator	
Identification of Evaluation Letters from Candidate's List vs PTU's List	
Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation (optional)	
External Letters of Evaluation	

*Sections IV and V together should not exceed 25 pages, font size must be at least 11 point, all margins must be at least one inch, line spacing must not exceed six lines of text per vertical inch, and page size must be letter (8.5 inches X 11 inches).

NOTE: Do not submit appendices for university level review.

Appendix H: Recommended Vita Format

In an effort to produce a more uniform reporting procedure, the following outline is recommended for the vita (Section IV) in promotion and/or tenure dossiers.

1) Academic History

1. Name
2. Present rank: Recommended rank:
3. Allocation of effort (% time) assignments
4. Tenure status
5. Administrative title (if any)
6. Graduate Faculty status
7. Highest degree, the institution, the date
8. List of academic positions in chronological order with titles and inclusive dates
9. Other professional employment (current and previous), dates
10. Post-graduate awards (fellowships, lectureships, etc.)

2) Instruction

1. Courses Taught, including title, enrollments, and credit hours
2. Development of new courses
3. Supervision of Graduate Student Research, including degree objective, graduation date, current placement of student
4. Graduate Student Advisory Committee Membership
5. Supervision of Undergraduate Research, including thesis status, period of supervision, current placement of student
6. Internship supervision
7. Instructional Grants Received (dates, dollar amounts [total & amount to the candidate], investigator status)
8. Recognitions and Outstanding Achievements (prizes, fellowships, awards won by your students etc.)
9. Academic Advising
10. Professional development

3) Scholarly Activities/Creative Work

If joint endeavors are listed on the CV, faculty should briefly describe how authorship order is assigned in their discipline. Scholarly outputs appropriate to the discipline and as specified by the PTU criteria, should be listed. Peer-reviewed and invited items should be identified as such with asterisks or other markers as defined in the CV by the candidate.

1. Publications (Indicate number of pages for books or chapters).
 - (a) Books authored or co-authored (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions

- (b) Books edited and co-edited (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions
 - (c) Chapters in books (in print or accepted)
 - (d) Monographs (longer than articles, in print or accepted)
 - (e) Journal articles (in print or accepted)
 - (f) Bulletins or reports (in print or accepted)
 - (g) Abstracts (in print or accepted)
 - (h) Book reviews (in print or accepted)
 - (i) Patents
 - (j) Works submitted but not yet accepted
 - (k) Any other (e.g., popular articles)
 - (l) Creative contributions other than formal publications
2. Grants received (dates, amounts [total & amount to the candidate], principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or co-investigator status)
 3. Recognitions and outstanding achievements (prizes, fellowships, etc.)
 4. Supervision of student research (including number of theses and dissertations supervised)
 5. Convention papers/Proceedings
 6. Presentations
 - a. Invited seminars/lectures
 - b. Conference talks
 - c. Poster presentations
- 4) Public service
1. Extension,
 2. International programs,
 3. Local community services and relations, and
 4. To governmental and nongovernmental agencies
- 5) Professional service
1. Service to professional societies, governmental organizations or nongovernmental agencies
 2. Editorships or editorial board memberships for journals or other learned publications
 3. Ad hoc manuscript reviewer
 4. Grant review panel member
 5. Ad hoc grant reviewer
 6. External evaluator of promotion/tenure dossier
 7. Service on departmental, college, or University committees
 8. Special administrative assignments
 9. Service to student groups and organizations
 10. Service to support units such as libraries, computing services and health services

A

Affirmative Action, 9, 23, 39

Annual Evaluation, 8, 25

Appeals, 7-9, 13, 36-39

Applied research, 18, 20

Appointment

criteria for, 7, 13

joint, 30-31, 43

research and creative activities as, 16-18

service as, 18-21

teaching as, 14-16

procedures for, 23-24

Assistant Professor, 10, 22, 40

limited term, 39

preliminary consideration of, 26

promotion to, 22, 39

rank of, 22

third year review of, 25-26

Associate Professor, 10, 23, 40

annual evaluation of, 25

preliminary consideration of, 26

promotion to, 22-23

rank of, 23

C

Conflict of interest, 8, 10, 14, 29, 32, 35, 38

Creative activities, 7, 13, 25, 40

evidence of contributions to, 16-18

D

Dossier, 10

and responsibilities of PTU head, 27-30, 42-43

preparing, 25-28, 42-43

principle of flow of, 8, 11, 29, 33, 42

E

External letters, 26, 27–28, 30, 52

F

Faculty

responsibilities of, 7

in PTU Review process, 28–31

Faculty development, 8

G

Grants, 16–19, 21

I

Instructor, 11, 22, 39, 40, 41, 50

annual evaluation, 25

rank of, 22

J

Joint Academic Appointments,

promotion, 30-31

tenure, 43

L

Liability coverage, 9

P

Peer evaluations, 15

Principle of flow

of dossier, 8, 11, 29, 34, 43

- Probationary period, 11–12, 39, 41–42, 50
- Procedural error, 8, 11, 31–38
- Professor, 11, 22–23, 25, 41
- Promotion
 - advisement about, 25
 - criteria for, 13–14
 - contributions in service as, 18–21
 - contributions to research, scholarship, and creative activities as, 16–18
 - contributions to teaching as, 14–16
 - early, 22
 - procedures for, 27–36
 - separate action from tenure, 44
- Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU), 12, 27–31
 - criteria at, 8–9, 25
 - deference to decision of, 8, 32
 - dossier for, 27–28
 - external letters for, 28, 30
 - function of, 24–27
 - third-year review, 25–26

R

Ranks

- requirement for, 21–23
- Research, 7, 13, 16, 25, 40
 - evidence of contributions to, 16–18

S

- Scholarship, 7, 12, 13–21, 25, 40
- School/College-Level Review, 31–34
- Search and screening committee, 23–24
- Service, 7, 25, 40
 - evidence of contributions to, 18–21
- Student evaluations, 14–15

T

Teaching, 7, 25, 40

 evidence of contributions to, 14–16

Tenure. See also Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU)

 advisement about, 25

 criteria for, 13–14, 40

 contributions in service as, 18–21

 contributions to research, scholarship and creative activities as, 16–18

 contributions to teaching as, 14–16

 eligibility to hold, 40–42

 for Administrative Position, 44

 preliminary consideration for, 26–27

 probationary period for, 41–42

 process of, 42–44

Terminal degree

 defined, 13, 21–22

Third-year review, 25–26

U

University Appeals Committee, 7, 8, 9, 13, 36, 37–39

University Review Committee, 7, 13, 30–31, 33, 34–36