Promotion and Tenure Considerations at Grady: 
A Procedural Brief

The following combines some of the key issues in the University guidelines with the Grady College guidelines. This is not a comprehensive document, but rather, an overview of these issues.

UGA guidelines are available at: http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies-procedures/tenure

Department

Eligible faculty within the PTU will vote by secret ballot, except for the PTU head. The total number of yes and no votes must be recorded. Abstentions are not allowed. More yes than no votes must be recorded in order for the candidate to be approved. The PTU head’s vote must be revealed at the time the votes are counted. All absentee and regular ballots must be counted by two faculty members, with the results presented to the faculty before adjournment. The candidate must be informed of the results of the vote, including the tally, within three working days of the meeting.

The dossier goes forward with a cover letter from the PTU head (or his/her designee). The candidate will have five working days to read and respond in writing to any cover letter or rationale before it goes forward. The candidate must have access to this letter, which includes the vote of the eligible PTU faculty. Before a dossier goes forward, the candidate should review Sections 1 through 4 for accuracy. Identification of any external evaluators must be deleted. Since Section 1 reports results and Section 2 represents a synthesis of faculty judgment, the candidate may correct only manifest errors in reported facts.

Upon completion of departmental review, the department will transmit the candidate’s dossier to the Dean’s office for the college review. In all cases, at the college committee’s 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 the Guidelines (ref. University/College guidelines).

College Promotion and Tenure Committee

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.
Department faculty should meet and recommend members to the dean for the committee. The dean will make the final selection of the members of the review committee. The committee consists of nine eligible faculty members of the college. The college review committee can never be fewer than five voting members. The chair is elected from among the tenured professors of the committee. Voting will be conducted by secret ballot with two designated faculty members assigned to count the ballots. Absentee ballots are not allowed. No members will abstain or recuse themselves unless a significant conflict of interest exists requiring such recusal. Faculty members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in consideration and discussion 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 discussion and voting on any candidate from the member’s own PTU.

The department’s recommendation may be reversed only if at least 2/3 majority of the committee members vote to reverse the outcome at the lower level. It has been our practice to verbally convey the results to the relevant department head, who informs the candidate. The committee must record the rationale for its decision to affirm or reverse the lower-level decision. This rationale will be drafted by the committee chair and reviewed by committee members but will not be signed by members of the committee. This rationale should be completed within three working days. 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. Any such response of the candidate will be included in the dossier for consideration at the University level. Regardless of the outcome of the college vote (favorable or unfavorable) the dossier will be forwarded for a review at the University level.

If the college committee finds a clear procedural error that likely affected the substantive outcome of the lower-level review process, it may remand the case for correction of the error by the department if such error can be corrected within the current promotion/tenure cycle, after which the case will be resubmitted to the college committee. In the event that the procedural error cannot be corrected at the lower level, the committee may, with the candidate’s participation and cooperation, supplement the record in any way necessary to allow for the fullest substantive and fair review possible. Cases may occur in which the procedural error fatally undermined the candidate’s ability to achieve a record worthy of promotion or tenure. In order to remedy such an error, the committee may vote positively on the candidate’s application. The committee may also determine that any procedural error at the lower-level was harmless because it had no substantive impact on the candidate’s application for promotion or tenure, in which case the committee may proceed to consider the substance of the candidate’s application.

**Role of the Dean**

All promotion and tenure decisions (including both positive and negative decisions) must be sent to the dean for review. The dean (or the dean’s 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 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 department and college.
The dean, or designate, will be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the college review committee. After the vote has been taken at the college level, the dean (or his/her designee) will write a letter evaluating the candidate, introducing the dossier as it goes forward to the University Review Committee. The letter will include the vote of the appropriate faculty of the department, as well as the vote of the 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.

Submission of Dossier Documents
Faculty Affairs established an electronic submission procedure for dossiers in 2009. The PTU head will forward the electronic dossier as well as one hard copy to the Dean’s Office. The preparation of electronic files and procedure will be coordinated by the Dean’s Office.
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