

UGA GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE
Approved by University Council 3/18/10
REVISIONS EFFECTIVE FALL 2010

https://uc.reg.uga.edu/pdf/2010_03_04_FacAffairs_Revised_Proposed_P&T_Revisions-2010_Spring.pdf

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

1. **Remove inconsistencies between glossary and text of guidelines on third-year review by revising the Glossary entry (p. 13):**

Third-Year Review - The intent of this review is to provide assistant professors with feedback (in writing) regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure, including the vote on the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure . The letter from the PTU Head to the candidate documenting feedback from the third-year review and any written response from the candidate must be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier at the time of the review.

2. **Clarify PTU Head's voting rights and timeline for candidate's reply (pp. 25-26)**

C. Third-Year Review for Assistant Professors - The third-year review, a formative process, occurs at the end of the third year of appointment for assistant professors. If an assistant professor comes to the University of Georgia with 2 or 3 years prior credit and requests to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the third year of appointment at the University of Georgia, preliminary consideration for promotion and/or tenure will replace the third-year review. Faculty members undergoing third-year review will prepare their dossiers in collaboration with the PTU Head detailing their achievements and performance in their assigned area(s) of responsibility. This dossier should take the form of Sections 4 and 5 of the promotion and tenure dossier (see Appendix C). The head of the PTU will appoint a faculty committee, in accordance with the appointment unit bylaws, to provide a thorough review of the individual's dossier. This committee will contain no fewer than three eligible faculty members. The review will be substantive and will provide the faculty member with critical feedback about his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure at the University of Georgia. The third-year review committee will report its findings to the PTU, and the eligible faculty, including the PTU Head, will vote to recommend whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The PTU head is not obligated to reveal his/her vote. The committee will then report its recommendations, along with the vote, to the PTU head. The PTU head will provide the faculty member under review with a written report regarding his/her progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days and any reply becomes part of the report. The PTU head's letter, and any response by the candidate, will be included in the promotion and/or tenure dossier when it is developed.

Preliminary Consideration (pp. 26-27)

3. **In cases where candidate cannot go forward with a negative vote, preliminary consideration is not just advisory to the candidate, so remove text that it is not a formal part of the process. Add headers to Asst Prof and Assoc Prof sections, and clarify when process will proceed for Assoc Profs:**

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

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

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

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

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

4. Clarify no PTU faculty contact with individuals on candidate's external evaluator no contact list:

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

Promotion/Tenure-Unit Review (p. 30)

5. Allow PTU head to provide rationale for a negative PTU vote, regardless of how the PTU head voted:

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

External Letters of Evaluation (p. 28 & 47-48)

6. Appendix D should be the letter template for external evaluation requests, not a sample letter:

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

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

7. Change title to Letter "Template" and that PTU head can add clarifying information to the template:

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.

8. Add "creative" and "artistic" contributions to sentence in first paragraph of letter.

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

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

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

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

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

Obtain at least four from authorities outside the University who can provide a critical, detailed evaluation of the candidate's work. Provide the external evaluator with the candidate's vita and examples of the candidate's best scholarly works. Obtain letters from individuals who know the candidate professionally (preferably through his/her publications, presentations, artistic creations or performances) and who are able to judge the candidate's reputation and relative status in the field. Do not solicit letters from the candidate's former major professor, former students, close associates or friends. Request a critical evaluation of the candidate's performance and quality of scholastic achievements; do not solicit supporting letters or personal references. Do not contact anyone the candidate has declared a nonevaluator. Make all letters received a part of the candidate's dossier. 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; and 2) A brief statement of the qualifications of each person evaluating the candidate.