## March 17, 2014

Dr. Silvia Giraudo, Chair of the Executive Committee University Council
The College of Family \& Consumer Sciences, CAMPUS
Dear Dr. Giraudo,
On 03/04/2014, the Faculty Affairs Committee approved and voted to forward the attached

- Suggested Revisions to UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, pp 30 \& 42, sections on joint appointments for promotion and tenure.
to the Executive Committee of University Council for consideration and placement on the April 23, 2014 Council agenda.

UGA Academic Affairs Policy 1.04-6 Joint Academic Appointment Policy that defines joint academic appointments can be found at: http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies-procedures/academic/academic-affairs/1-faculty/104-other-terminology/104-6-ioint-appointments/

If you have questions concerning this item, please feel free to contact me by e-mail at thiab@cs.uga.edu

Regards,

Thiab Taha, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee
Tel: 7065423455

# Suggested Revisions Guidelines for P\&T of Joint Academic Appointments 

## Objective

Incorporate the Principle of Flow into voting procedures for candidates with a joint academic appointment as described in UGA Academic Affairs Policy 1.04-6. Specifically, need to determine voting procedures for a School/College or University Review Committee when they receive conflicting votes from prior level of review - positive vote from one unit(s) and negative vote from other unit(s).

Current Wording, Guidelines p. 30-promotion and p. 42-tenure
Joint Appointments: If a faculty member has a joint appointment with .50 eft assigned to each of two promotion- and tenure-granting academic units, then either unit may initiate consideration for promotion (tenure) and prepare the documentation. The documentation will be made available to the appropriate (tenured) faculties of the two academic units concerned. The vote of each unit should be recorded in the dossier and provided to the candidate (tenure-and forwarded to the next higher level of review, as described in Section VII. Since tenure resides at the institutional level, a candidate who is recommended for tenure in one unit, but not in a second, may be granted tenure if the record of achievements and need for services merit tenure at the institution.) If both units vote to grant promotion, the dossier flows to the next higher level for review. However, if one unit votes to promote the candidate and the other unit votes to deny, the dossier is forwarded to the University Appeals Committee for action.
http://provost.uga.edu/documents/guidelines appt promotion tenure revised spring_13[2].pdf
Suggested Revisions (to replace above on $p$. 30-promotion and $p$. 42-tenure and includes chart)
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 (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 promotion (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 promotion (tenure) and requires a $2 / 3$ majority of the eligible voters to reverse the outcome. Any questions about the promotion (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 |  | **University Review Committee |
| PTU 2 | School/College Committee |  |
| 4) Both PTUs are a School/Colleges with No Departments |  |  |
| PTU 1 |  | **University Review Committee |
| PTU 2 |  |  |

