University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
univcouncil@uga.edu
www.uga.edu

University Council

To: President Jere W. Morehead

Re: Recommendations of the University Council from the April 15, 2026, Meeting

Document Number: 2026.04.15.13

Issue: A proposal from the Faculty Affairs Committee for a proposed revision of the UGA Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty.

Discussion: None.

Action: The vote was called, and the proposal was approved.

Submitted by: Fiona Liken — 4/20/26
Fiona Liken, Secretary — Date

- [x] Approved
- [ ] Reconsider
- [ ] Vetoed (see attached explanation)
- [ ] Received

Jere W. Morehead, President — 4/23/26
Date

The University of Georgia

Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty

Approved by the University Council

Revised by the University Council

Spring,2006

Fall,2007

Spring,2010,2011

Fall,2011

Spring,2013,2014,2017,2020

Fall 2022, 2025

Spring 2026

Latest revisions take effect April 23, 2026

Table of Contents

I. Introduction to the Guidelines 1
II. Glossary 4
III. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure 7
  a. Contributions to Teaching
  b. Contributions to Research, Scholarship, and Other Creative Activities
  c. Contributions to Service to Society, the University, and the Profession
IV. Requirement for Ranks 12
V. Procedures for Appointment 13
VI. Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) 14
  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 Promotion 16
  a. Preparing for Promotion and/or Tenure-Unit Evaluation
  b. Reviews
VIII. Appeals 24
IX. Limited-Term Assistant Professors 25
X. Procedures for Tenure 26
  a. Definition
  b. Criteria
  c. Regulations
  d. Tenure Process
XI. Appendices 30
  Appendix A: Appointment Package Outline
  Appendix B: Sample Letter Requesting a Reference
  Appendix C: Outline of 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

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 generating and advancing knowledge in service to the people of Georgia, the nation, and the world. For more than two centuries, faculty at the University of Georgia 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 also responsible for attracting the very best students to the institution. For these reasons, appointing, developing and retaining an outstanding faculty is critical to the success of the University. Because of their sustained and highly visible scholarship, which is recognized nationally and/or internationally and which informs their teaching and service, tenure-track faculty members play a central role in achieving the University's major objectives. These *Guidelines* outline the policies, standards, and procedures for the appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia.

The University System of Georgia Board of Regents defines Academic Rank Faculty as faculty on the tenure-track — Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors—as well as Instructors. These *Guidelines* apply to all processes in the appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty. Because Instructors are not eligible for tenure, these *Guidelines* apply only to the appointment and annual evaluation of Instructors.

The processes in the appointment, promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty 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 on the successful recruitment, development, and evaluation of tenure-track faculty. These *Guidelines* provide direction that both protects the rights of tenure-track faculty while also meeting 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*. Tenure resides at the university level, so it is the responsibility of all UGA faculty and administrators to know and consistently follow the established process and procedures described in these *Guidelines.* All meetings, deliberations, and communications described in the *Guidelines* are confidential. 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 tenure-track faculty of the University of Georgia are generally allocated across 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 all three areas, unless assigned otherwise. While there is no standard workload assignment across the institution, tenure-track faculty workload assignment is usually a mix of time allocated across 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 by tenure-track faculty. Appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty must fit a promotion/tenure unit's particular mission within the broader institution, thus the need for evaluation criteria at the PTU level.

All review committees and the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee charged with implementing these *Guidelines* must use discipline-specific criteria to evaluate the quality of faculty performance relative to decisions regarding appointment, promotion, and tenure. For new tenure-track 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 Promotion and Tenure 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:

- **Faculty Development**. Professional development takes place at all stages of a faculty member's career. New tenure-track 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 or PTU heads is essential to ensure that faculty are knowledgeable about how to succeed at the University of Georgia. The third-year review process for tenure-track 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 their unit. Tenured associate professors and professors also have distinct career development needs that should be recognized and accommodated at the University of Georgia. The purpose of these *Guidelines* is to articulate appointment, promotion, and tenure processes as integral to tenure-track faculty development in order to create an environment of excellence, honesty, and fairness.
- **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 eligible voting 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 eligible voting members of a school/college committee will move forward to the eligible voting members of a 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 Promotion and Tenure 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 their colleagues within the PTU.
- **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 tenure-track 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.
- **Development and Use of Criteria at the Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU)**. Finally, these *Guidelines* require that the tenure-track faculty members of each promotion and tenure 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 tenure-track 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 tenure-track 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 tenure-track 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee will be provided with a copy of the appointment unit's criteria to use in evaluating a candidate's dossier.
- **Development and Use of Bylaws and Procedures at Unit Level**. In addition to the development of discipline-specific criteria, each department/school/college must have written bylaws or procedures that align with University guidelines. These bylaws will describe the procedures that will be used to constitute review committees composed of eligible voting faculty and otherwise implement these *Guidelines*.

The University of Georgia (the "University") is committed to maintaining a fair and respectful environment for living, work, and study. To that end, and in accordance with federal and state law, University System of Georgia ("USG") policy, and University policy, the University prohibits harassment of or discrimination against any person on the basis of an individual's age, color, disability, genetic information, national origin, race, religion, sex, or veteran status ("protected status") by any member of the University Community (as defined below) on campus, in connection with a University program or activity, or in a manner that creates a hostile environment for any member of the University Community. Incidents of harassment and discrimination will be met with appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal or expulsion from the University.
https://legal.uga.edu/policies/non-discrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy/

Only eligible voting tenure-track faculty, committees of eligible voting tenure-track faculty, heads of PTUs or approved substitutes, and deans are to consider a candidate's qualifications against the criteria set out in these *Guidelines* and against discipline-specific criteria developed by tenure-track faculty in 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.

I. GLOSSARY

Academic Rank Faculty – Per the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' Policy Manual, instructors, and tenure-track faculty (assistant professors, associate professors and professors) are awarded academic rank. However, because Instructors are not eligible for tenure or promotion, these *Guidelines* only apply to the appointment and annual evaluation of Instructors.

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.

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. Tenure-track assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate for their disciplines. Individuals in this rank cannot hold tenure.

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. Individuals in this rank can hold tenure.

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 a tenure-track assistant professor during the third-year review.

Conflict of interest – Faculty members with a conflict of interest that would preclude their ability to render a fair and objective review of a candidate's dossier during appointment, annual evaluation, preliminary consideration, promotion, tenure, and post tenure view must recuse themselves from participation in the recommendation/review. Such conflicts of interest may include 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 PTU 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 – Only tenure-track faculty specified below may conduct or vote on the appointment, third-year review, preliminary consideration, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review of tenure-track faculty. Tenure-track faculty eligible to vote are as follows:

- On appointment, all tenure-track faculty;
- On third-year review, all tenured faculty;
- On preliminary consideration and promotion to associate professor, all associate professors and professors;
- On preliminary consideration and promotion to professor, all professors;
- On preliminary consideration and tenure, all tenured faculty members;
- On post-tenure review, all tenured faculty members;
- On College/School or PTU-level promotion and tenure guidelines, all tenure-track faculty members.

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.

Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) – The PRP is used to document faculty deficiencies identified in the annual evaluation and provide specific guidance in enabling the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources, wherever the permanent faculty files are housed.

Preliminary Consideration – The vote of eligible voting faculty as defined in these *Guidelines* in the PTU to solicit external letters of evaluation. The tenure-track candidate must request that they 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 annual performance evaluation; (2) failure to consult candidates regarding external evaluations; (3) failure of the PTU to vote in accordance with mandated procedures, including allowing ineligible voters to vote; (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. Individuals in this rank typically hold tenure, except in exceptional circumstances.

Promotion and Tenure Unit (PTU) – The organization of tenure-track faculty responsible for voting on appointment, preliminary consideration, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review for tenure-track faculty. 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 PTU that describes in detail the expectations that must be met before a candidate may earn tenure or be promoted. These criteria must be in writing, must be consistent with these *Guidelines*, must be consistent with these *Guidelines,* must be accepted by tenure-track faculty in the PTU, and must be approved by the department head, 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 PTU has established for promotion and/or tenure reviews.

Promotion and Tenure Unit head (PTU head)– The tenured department head or appointed substitute responsible for all processes and procedures related to appointment, annual evaluation, preliminary consideration, third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review processes for tenure-track faculty. 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, a tenured faculty member selected as outlined by the school or college guidelines. Only tenured faculty members of appropriate rank can implement policies and procedures for promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty described in these *Guidelines*. If the department head is tenured, that person shall serve as the PTU head. If not, an eligible faculty member shall be appointed as PTU head from the tenured faculty by the dean after consultation with the tenure-track faculty.

Review Committees –-Committees composed of eligible voting faculty members for departments, schools/colleges, and the university level who review promotion and tenure candidates.

Scholarship – The intellectual activities expected of tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia as they carry 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 composed of eligible voting faculty, 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.

Student Success Activities – Student success activities, as defined in University of Georgia Academic Affairs Policy Number 03.03.005, is a comprehensive term for faculty effort expended to support the short- and long-term academic and professional achievements of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students and trainees. Student success is supported by in-class as well as outside-of-class efforts. Involvement in student success activities is not predicated on additional allocation of effort but is included within the faculty member's allocation of effort in instruction, research/scholarship/creative work, service, and administration, as applicable. PTUs are responsible for further specification of student success activities in their criteria for all review processes as relevant to their disciplines and practices.

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 – Academic rank faculty members at the University of Georgia who hold the positions of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. This term often is used in an inclusive fashion and describes both as yet untenured and also tenured faculty members.

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

Third-Year Review – The intent of this review is to provide tenure-track 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee – The University Council committee that reviews negative recommendations for promotion and/or tenure from the University Review Committee. The committee consists of tenured Professors, one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia. While serving on this committee, faculty cannot serve on other promotion and tenure committees at the School, College, or University level. The Chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee shall be the committee's immediate past Chair-Elect. (See the Committee's Bylaws on the University Council website.)

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

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

II. APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Criteria for appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty at the University follow from the University's mission to teach, to inquire into the nature of things and to serve society. Tenure-track faculty at the University of Georgia must meet the following tripartite primary responsibilities: teaching; research, scholarship, or other creative activities; and service to society, the University, and the profession, including Student Success Activities, as appropriate. Academic appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty are based on a candidate's performance in these assigned areas. Those tenure-track faculty eligible to vote are expected to participate in the critical activities of appointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty except when there exists a significant conflict of interest. See the Glossary for definition of eligible voting faculty.

A. Contributions to Teaching

The Standard

Teaching helps students develop knowledge, skills, and abilities within their chosen discipline and dispositions to continue learning. The University distinguishes between routine classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw on the teacher's depth and breadth of scholarly knowledge and their teaching expertise. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. Use of the term "effective" and "effectiveness" throughout the document refers to the need to provide evidence that has been systematically collected and analyzed to support claims about teaching quality and teaching improvement. The term "systematic" means that evidence of contributions to teaching has been gathered, reviewed, and presented in an organized and methodical way that aims to reduce potential bias, allow for coherent evaluation, and promote continuous teaching improvement.

Documentation

Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and development and in improvements in the learning

environment and curriculum appropriate to the discipline. Consistent with Academic Affairs Policy Statement No. 01.06.005, Improvement and Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness, evidence of teaching effectiveness should include, but is not limited to, any combination of evidence from the student voice (category 1) and at least one of the other voices (category 2 peer voice OR category 3 self voice) listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution.

1. Student voice. The following are forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness from the student perspective:
    a) A list of courses accompanied by the following information from student end-of-course experience surveys, as described in Academic Affairs Policy Statement 01.06.005, Improvement and Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness: (i) response rates for the surveys (how many students completed the survey compared with how many students were enrolled in the course and (ii) information about the distribution (e.g., range) and representativeness of students' responses (e.g., mode) for the scaled survey items required in the policy. Note: If students' responses are not available by scale category but only as means, means can be used. However, it is best practice with ordinal, scaled data like these to report distributions and modes rather than means. Additionally, instructors' evaluations should not be compared to departmental, college, or school averages, because this practice does not account for the myriad personal and contextual differences that can lead to variation in students' responses. This information should be presented for all courses taught in the previous three years that have been evaluated unless a candidate seeks early promotion, in which case information for two years is sufficient.
    b) Program surveys of alumni attesting to the candidate's instructional contributions to alumni preparation for further education and careers, accompanied by a brief explanation of the survey, survey methods, and survey response rates.
    c) Performance of students on uniform examinations, in standardized courses, or from assessment data appropriate to the discipline, collected as part of program outcomes assessment.
    d) Effective direction of graduate study including theses and dissertations. Documentation should include patterns of student progress toward degree, retention of students in programs and research group, or student scholarship or creative works.
    e) Effective direction of undergraduate independent study, research, internships, or externships with evidence of effectiveness.

2. Peer voice. The following are forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness from the peer perspective:
    a) Systematic observations of instruction at multiple timepoints by peers following unit-established methods of documenting effective teaching (e.g., observation protocols, rubrics, review of instructional materials).
    b) Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
    c) Invited or selected participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation, or international study and development projects.
    d) Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams or special commissions.
    e) Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.
    f) Adoption of a candidate's instructional materials such as textbooks and online materials, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.
    g) Peer-reviewed, invited, or selected activities related to teaching, including any of the following:
        i. Publications that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and teaching scholarship.
        ii. Presentations on teaching before professional societies.
        iii. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative and evidence-based educational activities or to fund stipends for students.

3. Self voice. The following are forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness from the candidate's perspective:
    a. Descriptions of teaching decisions (i.e., actions taken) accompanied by sound rationale.

b. Descriptions of development or significant revision of programs and courses accompanied by systematic observations of impact on students.
c. Publication or presentation activities related to teaching that do not involve peer-review or other selection processes, including any of the following:
    i. Textbooks, curriculum materials, published lecture notes, abstracts, or articles that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and teaching scholarship.
    ii. Presentation of papers on teaching before professional societies.
d. Development of departmental or institutional governance or academic policy and procedure as related to teaching.
e. Sustained participation in teaching professional development that aligns with the candidate's efforts to improve their teaching, and demonstration of how participation has impacted the candidate's teaching practice.

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 the improvement, 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, and tenure-track faculty are expected to discover new ideas, to fashion new interpretations of enduring ideas, and to participate in the application of these ideas. Consequently, they 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 their participation in each instance.

Tenure-track 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, and Student Success 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 analyses).
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 students' and post-doctoral associates' 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, and Student Success Activities, as appropriate. 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).
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.

III. 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 areas such as the studio arts.

Exceptions to the terminal degree requirement for appointments for tenure-track faculty 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, tenure-track 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 their delegate.

Instructor
The rank of instructor is an entry-level position for the University. Instructors are not eligible for tenure. 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 tenure-track faculty member at the University. Assistant professors cannot hold tenure. Requirements include the following:

- Degree: Candidates should have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines.
- Years in Rank: Candidates do not need a minimum number of years in a lower rank unless the initial appointment was at the instructor level at the University of Georgia.
- Criteria: Candidates should show promise of moving toward excellence in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments.

Associate Professor
The rank of associate professor is the mid-career tenure-track faculty rank at the University. Associate professors are eligible for and can hold tenure. 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 a tenure-track 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 of this document, *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty*, and the criteria established by their PTU.

Professor
The rank of professor is the highest rank at the University. Professors typically hold tenure except in exceptional circumstances. 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, per criteria listed in part III of this document, *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty*, and the criteria established by their PTU. They should demonstrate sustained and highly-visible research recognized nationally and/or internationally that informs their teaching and service and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

IV. PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS

When filling a full-time tenure-track faculty position, the appointment unit head (typically the department head),

director, or dean will appoint a search and screening committee composed of a majority of tenure-track faculty. The search and screening committee may consult with faculty in other faculty ranks as well as with students and others as appropriate. 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 and international 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 their designee) has the option to interview acceptable applicants for positions of tenured 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 faculty appointments in the unit. All eligible voting faculty (See the Glossary for definition of eligible voting faculty) are expected to participate in the PTU evaluation process by voting yes or no by secret ballot to recommend candidates for full-time tenure-track faculty appointments in the unit. This vote will be reported to the tenure-track faculty of the appointment unit, as well as to the department head, PTU head, or dean.

The dean (or their designee) reviews the vote of the appointment unit and any recommendations developed by the search committee and forwards their 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.

V. PROMOTION AND TENURE UNIT (PTU)

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 tenure-track faculty of the unit and approved by the dean. These criteria must be in writing, must have the broad support of the tenure-track faculty in the PTU, 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 tenure-track 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 PTU. The department head 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. Tenure-track 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. Tenure-track 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 department or 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 their PTU 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 department or PTU head (according to College-level guidelines approved by tenure-track faculty) with the faculty member and preparation of a written report to the faculty member, who may respond to the report in writing. See UGA Academic Affairs Policy Number 03.03.001, Annual Evaluation.

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, tenured department head, or an appointed and approved tenured substitute 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 PTU head will appoint a committee of no fewer than three tenured faculty members to provide a thorough review of the individual's dossier. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about their progress toward promotion and/or tenure at the University of Georgia.

The third-year review committee will report its findings only to the tenured faculty in the PTU, and the eligible voting 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 be present for this vote. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal their vote. The committee will 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 their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the third-year review. The faculty member may reply in writing to the report within 10 working days, and any reply becomes part of the report. Within 5 working days from the faculty member's reply, the PTU head will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the third-year review made because of the faculty member's written reply. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.

If the performance in any of the faculty member's assigned areas of effort is judged to reflect insufficient progress toward promotion and/or tenure, the PTU head, third-year review committee, and faculty member must develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The PRP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member, and remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period. The PRP generated by third-year review should be harmonized with a PRP generated by annual evaluation, as needed, and must be approved by the dean. The faculty member will have one year from the most recent update of the PRP to demonstrate a trajectory of appropriate progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

D. Renewal of Tenure-Track Faculty Not Yet Tenured

In any year, a department head may recommend to the dean not to extend a contract to a tenure track faculty member who is not yet tenured. This determination may be made following a recommendation to the department head (or for schools and colleges with no departments directly to the dean) by the tenured faculty in the unit, 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 to the department head that they 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 eligible voting faculty so they may consider those individuals who are being evaluated for promotion and tenure. A quorum (2/3 of the eligible voting faculty) is required for each vote; absentee ballots do not count towards quorum. Based on an updated vita and other materials deemed relevant by the unit, eligible voting faculty will vote on whether they believe the candidate warrants further consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The PTU 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 their vote. The outcome of the vote for preliminary consideration will not appear in the dossier.

Nontenured Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors: Following the preliminary consideration vote, the candidate may decide whether to proceed with the full review. Tenure-track 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 PTU head, the eligible voting faculty, 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 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 of review may continue unless the candidate chooses to withdraw. If a candidate for professor proceeds to full review and 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.

VI. 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.), tenure-track 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 eligible voting faculty in the PTU (see Glossary for definition of eligible voting 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 tenure-track faculty member is responsible for assuring that all relevant and salient information is available and for preparing the vita according to these *Guidelines,* the PTU 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 their 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 reviewers 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. The PTU Head should request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and the quality of their scholastic achievements-and should 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 6 potential external evaluators and provide information on their qualifications as reviewers to the PTU head. At least 2 of the external letters in the dossier must be from the candidate's list and at least 2 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 3 individuals who may not be contacted as external evaluators. The PTU head 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 PTU head is an associate professor, then the PTU head, following consultation with the PTU, will appoint a tenured professor to chair the committee to review candidates for promotion to the rank of professor. The substitute is responsible for working with the candidate to prepare the dossier for review and for preparing Sections 1 and 2 after the unit evaluation is completed.

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 outside influence.

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.* Eligible voting 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 eligible voting faculty 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. Tenure-track 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 must be cast in writing. They do not count toward the quorum. To count toward the vote, they must be received by the tenured department head or approved substitute before the meeting begins. Absentee ballots received after the meeting begins will be disregarded. Absentee ballots without a 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 eligible voting faculty (see Glossary for definition) to conduct the PTU evaluation. Eligible voting 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 vote of the PTU head must be revealed at the time the votes are counted. All absentee and regular ballots must be counted by 2 eligible voting faculty members, with

the results presented to the eligible voting faculty before adjournment. The candidate must be informed of the results of the vote, including the tally, within 3 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 they do 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 an eligible voting 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, external letters will be removed. Since Section 1 reports results and Section 2 represents a synthesis of the judgment of the eligible voting faculty, 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. Outlines for tenure and promotion cover letters are presented in Appendices E and F. In the event the PTU vote was negative, the PTU Head, regardless of their vote, will summarize the deliberation for the PTU's negative vote as a separate document in the dossier. The candidate will have 5 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 voting faculty. The PTU head 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 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		
PTU 2	**School/College Committee	University Review Committee

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/College with No Departments		
PTU 1		** 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 head 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 or PTU head 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 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 voting faculty members of the school/college. The chair is elected from among the tenured professors of the committee by vote 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. The cover letter should state that a quorum was present.

- *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 tenured 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:

i. 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.
ii. 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 tenured 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 tenured 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.
iii. With the candidate's participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible.
iv. 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.

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.

e. *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 their 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 their 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 their 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 eligible voting 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 PTU head who 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 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 voting 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 Promotion and Tenure 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 annual performance evaluations.
- Failure to consult a candidate regarding external evaluations.
- Failure of the PTU to vote in accordance with mandated procedures such as allowing ineligible faculty to vote
- 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.

VII. APPEALS

When a candidate receives a negative recommendation from the University Review Committee (either because the University Review Committee does not 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee unless the candidate chooses to withdraw their application in writing. The committee consists of tenured Professors, one representing each of the schools/colleges of the University of Georgia. While serving on this committee, faculty cannot serve on other promotion and tenure committees at the School, College, or University level. The Chair of the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee shall be the committee's immediate past Chair-Elect. (See the Committee's Bylaws on the University Council website.)

The University Promotion and Tenure 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee, the candidate must be notified of their 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 such as allowing ineligible faculty to vote or to operate in accordance with procedures mandated in these *Guidelines.*

The responsibility of the candidate (or their 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee.

The responsibility of the University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee is to make its best judgment (1) as to 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 Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee: Tenured 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 tenured 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 tenured voters present at the meeting, the University Promotion and Tenure 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 Promotion and Tenure 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, PTUh, 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 Promotion and Tenure 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 committee or formation of an *ad hoc* committee of tenured faculty 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 Promotion and Tenure 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 their 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 Promotion and Tenure 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.

VIII. 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 tenure-track assistant professor rank by administrative action. That is, the PTU 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.

IX. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE

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 Section IV), 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.

A. Criteria

Candidates for tenure must have a record of exemplary performance in the discharge of their tripartite responsibilities in teaching; research or other creative activities; and service to society, the University and the profession, including Student Success Activities, as appropriate. 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 tenured faculty members make as stewards of the institution.

B. 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 tenure-track 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 head, consistent with a positive vote of eligible voting faculty, 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 member at minimum is appointed as associate professor or 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 tenure-track assistant professors are not eligible for tenure upon appointment. Tenure-track 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.

Non-tenured 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, honorific appointments, and faculty in other faculty ranks are not eligible for tenure and are not bound by time limits: Academic Professionals, Clinical Faculty, Lecturers, Librarians, Public Service Faculty, and Research Scientists.

2. **Time Limits.**

Instructor. The instructor rank is not eligible for tenure. 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 tenure-track 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 website. Additional information about medical leave may be found on the Division of Human Resources website.

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 tenure-track faculty and 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 tenure-track 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.

C. 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 tenure-track 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 tenure-track 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 PTU head will convene the eligible voting faculty who would make the preliminary consideration concerning tenure review. Based on an updated vita and any other materials deemed relevant by the unit, the eligible voting faculty in the PTU (see Glossary for definition) will decide whether to proceed with the tenure process for those tenure-track faculty who have requested tenure. This consideration should follow the same procedures for preliminary consideration of promotion.

   At this point, the tenure review process parallels the process for promotion. A dossier must be prepared for evaluation by the PTU. Preparation and verification of the contents of the dossier is a cooperative endeavor between the PTU head and the tenure-track 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, eligible voting faculty, 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 tenure-track 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 PTUs of the joint academic appointment units concerned. The vote of each PTU 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		
PTU 2	**School/College Committee	University Promotion and Tenure

		Review Committee
2) PTUs in Different Schools/Colleges		
PTU 1	School/College Committee 1	** University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
PTU 2	School/College Committee 2	
3) One PTU is a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1		** University Promotion and Tenure Review Committee
PTU 2	School/College Committee	
4) Both PTUs are a School/College with No Departments		
PTU 1		** University Promotion and Tenure 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 followed. 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**
   Tenure-track 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 who 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 their appointment. Assuming the candidate’s qualifications merit appointment as a tenured 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 how to organize it is 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 eligible voting faculty participating in the recommendation. List the total number of *Yes* and *No* votes of the participating eligible voting 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 their 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 potential activities and attainments in conventional vita form.

Section 3: Letters of Reference

Obtain at least 3 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. Email 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 tenure-track 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 tenure-track 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 for Appointment

Dear XX:

The University of Georgia is considering the appointment of Dr. YY to the rank of ZZ. 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 YY'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. The candidate's reputation and relative standing in their field.
3. The 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 their 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 their 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, as appropriate, in relation to the criteria in these *Guidelines* in 12 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 recommended 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 include 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 4 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.

The following information must also be included in Section 7 of the dossier:

1. Identification of which letters are from the candidate's list of evaluators and which letters are from the PTU's list of evaluators.
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 XX,
The University of Georgia is considering the promotion and/or tenure of Dr. YY to the rank of ZZ.

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 YY. 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 YY'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 of eligible voting faculty 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 they are to be tenured in and the specific areas they are assigned to ~~do~~ work in. 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 the present and in the future.
E. If there was any disparity between the eligible voting faculty recommendation and the opinion expressed in any of the external review letters, the PTU head must record the rationale for the PTU eligible voting 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. The 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 eligible voting 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; and service to society, the University and the profession. State that a quorum was present and give the vote of the eligible voting 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 their 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 eligible voting PTU faculty recommendation and the opinion expressed in any of the external review letters, the PTU head must record the rationale for the eligible voting 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 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_____

Select only one of the following:

Recommendation For: ☐Promotion & Tenure ☐Promotion Only ☐Tenure Only Promotion

To: ☐Assistant Professor ☐Associate Professor ☐Professor

☐ Contract Type: ☐Fiscal ☐Academic ☐Adjunct (not paid)

Area Committee: ☐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 and votes) ☐
   UGA Recommendation for Tenure Form (with all signatures and votes) ☐
4. Section II: PTU head Cover Letter(s) ☐
   Dean's Cover Letter(s) ☐
   School/College Review Committee Written Rationale 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) ☐
   Teaching/Research, Scholarship, Other Creative Activities/Service to Society, The University, The Profession
8. Section VI: Letter of Offer (include statement of any approved changes in assignment & MOU if joint appointment) ☐
   Annual Evaluations ☐
   Third-Year Review (for untenured TT faculty) ☐
9. Section VII: Brief Statement of Qualification of Each External Evaluator ☐
   Identification of Evaluation Letters from Candidate's List v. 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 8.5 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
    a. Name
    b. Present rank/Recommended rank
    c. Allocation of effort (% time) assignments
    d. Tenure status
    e. Administrative title (if any)
    f. Graduate faculty status
    g. Highest degree, the institution, the date
    h. List of academic positions in chronological order with titles and inclusive dates
    i. Other professional employment (current and previous), dates
    j. Post-graduate awards (fellowships, lectureships, etc.)
2. Instruction
    a. Courses taught, including title, enrollments, and credit hours
    b. Development of new courses
    c. Supervision of graduate student research, including degree objective, graduation date, current placement of student
    d. Graduate Student Advisory Committee Membership
    e. Supervision of undergraduate research, including thesis status, period of supervision, current placement of student
    f. Internship supervision
    g. Instructional grants received (dates, dollar amounts [total & amount to the candidate], investigator status)
    h. Recognitions and outstanding achievements (prizes, fellowships, awards won by your students, etc.)
    i. Academic advising
    j. 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.

    a. Publications (indicate number of pages for books or chapters)
        i. Books authored or co-authored (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions
        ii. Books edited and co-edited (in print or accepted) distinguish original editions and revisions
        iii. Chapters in books (in print or accepted)
        iv. Monographs (longer than articles, in print or accepted)
        v. Journal articles (in print or accepted)
        vi. Bulletins or reports (in print or accepted)
        vii. Abstracts (in print or accepted)
        viii. Book reviews (in print or accepted
        ix. Patents
        x. Works submitted but not yet accepted
        xi. Any other (e.g., popular articles)
        xii. Creative contributions other than formal publications

b. Grants received (dates, amounts [total & amount to the candidate], principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or co-investigator status)
c. Recognitions and outstanding achievements (prizes, fellowships, etc.)
d. Supervision of student research (including number of theses and dissertations supervised)
e. Convention papers/proceedings
f. Presentations
    i. Invited seminars/lectures
    ii. Conference talks
    iii. Poster presentations
g. Public service
    i. Extension
    ii. International programs
    iii. Local community services and relations
    iv. To governmental and nongovernmental agencies
h. Professional service
    i. Service to professional societies, governmental organizations or nongovernmental organizations
    ii. Editorships or editorial board memberships for journals or other learned publications
    iii. Ad hoc manuscript reviewer
    iv. Grant review panel member
    v. Ad hoc grant reviewer
    vi. External evaluator of promotion/tenure dossier
    vii. Service on departmental, college, or University committees
    viii. Special administrative assignments
    ix. Service to student groups and organizations
    x. Service to support units such as libraries, computing services, and health services

Index

This is a very basic index. Readers are encouraged to conduct keyword searches in the .pdf version of this document, which is posted on the Office of Faculty Affairs website: provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs.

See the **Glossary** on p. 4 for definitions of key terms.

A

Academic rank faculty 1, 4
Affirmative action 3, 14, 26
Annual evaluation 2, 4, 5, 15, 37
Appeals 24
Applied research 11-12
Appointment unit 1-2, 4, 9, 13-14, 19, 28, 32
Appointment unit head 4, 13
Assistant professor
- Limited term 25
- Rank of 1, 4, 6, 13
- Time limit 27

Associate professor
- Preliminary consideration of 16
- PTU Head 18
- Rank of 4, 13
- Time limit 27

C

Conflict of Interest 4
Creative activities
- Achievements in, presentation in dossier 32
- Standard for 11

Checklist for dossier contents 41

D

Dossier
- Definition 4
- Outline 32
- Revisions 19

E

Eligible voting faculty 4
External letters 5, 17-19, 33, 37

F

Faculty
- Responsibilities of 1-2, 12-13
- In PTU review process 7, 18-20
- Development of 2

G
Grants 9-10

I
Instructor
Rank of 1, 4-5, 13
Time limits 5

J
Joint appointments 28
06.
Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) 5
Preliminary consideration 5, 15
Principle of flow 2, 5, 14, 22, 28
Probationary period 5, 24, 27
Probationary credit 12-13, 27
Procedural error 5, 21
Professor 5, 13, 16, 18
Promotion
Advisement about 14
Contributions in service 10
Contributions to research, scholarship, and creative activities 9
Contributions to teaching 7
Early 12
Procedures for 16
PTU criteria for 1, 2, 6, 13
Requirements for ranks 11
Promotion and tenure unit (PTU) 4, 15-18
Criteria 1-2, 4, 13, 30
Deference to decision of 2, 20

R
Ranks
Requirement for 12
Recusal 18, 21, 01, 25
Research 1, 6, 9
Evidence of contributions to 9

S
Scholarship 1, 6, 9
School/college level review 5, 18, 20
Search and screening committee 12-13
Service 1, 10, 27
Evidence of contributions to 10
Sixth year rule 16
Student success activities 6-7, 9-10, 26

T
Teaching 1, 13

Evidence of contributions to 7
Tenure (see also PTU advisement about)
Criteria for 26
Contributions in service 10
Contributions to research, scholarship, and creative activities 9
Contributions to teaching 7
Definition 6, 26
Eligibility to hold 26
For administrative position 29
Preliminary consideration for 16
Probationary period for 27
Process of 26
Tenure-track faculty 6
Terminal degree defined 6, 12
Third year review 6, 15

U
University Promotion and Tenure Appeals Committee 1-2, 7, 24-25
University review committee 7, 18, 22-24, 28

V
Vita 17, 28, 32, 38

Y
Years in rank 7, 12-13