



Proposed Revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*

Faculty Meeting

October 18, 2016

Joseph Hughes

2015-16 Chair, Statutes Committee

Introduction

Note: None of these changes involve Statutes; only one reading needed.

This presentation summarizes the proposed changes. The precise wording was made available online as part of the meeting agenda.

During Spring 2016, these changes were approved by the Statutes Committee and endorsed by the Faculty Executive subject to several clarifications and corrections:

- Typographical, formatting, and wording consistency corrections
- Source of statement regarding promotions denied for budgetary reasons
- Consistency with topics included in *Handbook* regarding guidelines for promotion of tenure-track faculty

Summary of Proposed Changes

- **Section 3.2.2 Non-Tenure Track Academic Faculty: Hiring and Promotion Guidelines**
 - **Academic Professionals**
 - Relocate list of titles and add “Principal Academic Professional.”
 - Add “[work in] laboratory, and course development” to examples of appropriate academic assignments.
 - Add section on “Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion.” Includes expectations for each rank, promotion criteria, review procedures, and feedback at end of process.
 - **Lecturers/Senior Lecturers**
 - Specify documentation and process requirements for hiring.
 - Add section on “Guidelines for Appointment and Evaluation.” Includes expectations for each rank and evaluation/promotion procedures.

Clarifications and Corrections

- **Promotions Denied for Budgetary Reasons**
 - Academic Professional guidelines include “Any promotion denied for budgetary reasons shall be considered as deferred until sufficient funds become available.”
 - Matches language for tenure-track promotions (Section 3.3.6)
 - Does not appear to be included in University System Policy Manual
- **Consistency with Tenure-Track Faculty Guidelines**
 - Tenure-track guidelines cover a similar set of topics, but are divided into multiple sections in the *Faculty Handbook*:
 - Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty without Tenure (3.3.3)
 - Tenure and Promotion Overview (3.3.4)
 - Promotion (3.3.6)
 - Promotion and Tenure Evaluation (3.3.7)
 - Promotion and Tenure Procedures (3.3.8)

Detailed Changes (section 3.2.2)

Academic Professionals

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.8.3](#).

Academic Professional titles may be assigned to appropriate positions (as defined below). Persons in such positions may be involved in duties of a managerial, research, technical, special, career, public service or instructional support nature. **The ranks of the Academic Professional at Georgia Tech include: Associate Academic Professional, Academic Professional, Senior Academic Professional, and Principal Academic Professional.**

...

The designation Academic Professional would apply to a variety of academic assignments that call for academic background similar to that of a Faculty member with professorial rank, but which are distinctly different from professorial positions. Examples include managing instructional laboratories, assuming academic program management roles not suited for expectations applied to Tenure-Track Faculty members, operating instructional technology support programs, being responsible for general academic advising, assuming professional student counseling center responsibilities, providing specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs, ~~and~~-working with Tenure-Track Faculty members in course and curriculum development **and in the laboratory, and course delivery.**

...

Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion

- Associate Academic Professional. This is the entry-level rank and normally requires completion of the terminal degree. In exceptional cases, this rank may be used for individuals completing a terminal degree and for a period of two (2) years. If the degree is not conferred, another position appointment is required.
- Academic Professional. This rank requires a terminal degree. It also requires significant related experience or promotion from the rank of Associate Academic Professional. Ordinarily at least three (3) years as an Associate Academic Professional is required before promotion to the rank of Academic Professional. The quality of performance and potential for development must be recognized by peers. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment.
- Senior Academic Professional. This rank requires a terminal degree. It also requires evidence of superior performance in the chosen field, recognition by peers (whether national, regional, or local), and successful and measurable related experience. Promotion to Senior Academic Professional from the rank of Academic Professional requires at least five (5) years at that level. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment.

- **Principal Academic Professional.** This rank requires a terminal degree. It also requires evidence of superior performance in the chosen field, recognition by peers (whether national, regional, or local), and successful and measurable related experience, including but not limited to supervision of others' work, significant responsibility and authority within program area, and demonstrated impact in discipline and/or administrative function. Promotion to Principal Academic Professional from the rank of Senior Academic Professional requires at least six (6) years at that level. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment.

Minimum expectations in all Academic Professional ranks are listed below. The candidate does not need to demonstrate noteworthy achievement in all five (5) of the following areas, but must do so in number one (effective administration) and two of the others.

1. effectively carrying out assigned administrative duties within unit;
2. superior teaching, if applicable;
3. outstanding service to the Institute, and/or community
4. outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement, as defined by role; and
5. professional growth and development.

As part of the promotion process, the supervisor should submit a written recommendation setting forth the reasons for promotion. The Academic Professional's length of service with the Institute shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the individual should be promoted.

Promotion to the rank of Academic Professional or above additionally requires the earned doctorate or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Neither the possession of a doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee per se of promotion.

Any promotion denied for budgetary reasons alone shall be considered as deferred until sufficient funds become available.

After initial appointment, each candidate for promotion will be judged primarily on the basis of the quality of performance of her/his assigned responsibilities consistent with the appropriate position description and on whether or not she/he meets the criteria for the rank. The candidate will also be expected to have made significant progress in her/his own professional area. Documentation of this progress necessarily will be appropriate for the specific position and may include such items as professional recognition, awards, service in professional associations, creative activities, and service within the academic community and professional or disciplinary contributions. Section 3.3.7 of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook provides guidance related

to the evaluation of faculty members as teachers and educators and the evaluation of the research and service contributions of faculty. This guidance may be used as a framework for promotion consideration; however, evaluators should keep in mind that teaching and research together should constitute less than 50% of any Academic Professional's duties.

Academic Professional ranks constitute a career ladder, and minimum times in rank are generally required for consideration for promotion. However, promotion is not routine: Each rank has its own performance criteria. Thus, successful performance at one rank in and of itself does not necessarily imply having met the criteria for the next rank simply with the passage of time.

Promotion Procedures

Candidate's Responsibility

Preparation of the promotion dossier is the responsibility of the candidate in consultation with and support of his/her supervisor. The candidate has the responsibility to prepare and review the documentation that is submitted, except for the evaluation letters. However, the list provided by the candidate for external evaluators should be included in the package. When this documentation is complete, and in the proper format, the candidate will sign a statement that it is both accurate and complete.

Should the candidate fail to meet the deadlines established by the Unit for submission of the required documentation, consideration of promotion may be delayed until the following year.

The candidate should include at a minimum the following information:

- A position description (provided in conjunction with the supervisor), if the promotion includes a change in professional responsibilities.
- A self-statement by the candidate. The candidate should also write a brief summary of their major accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to their administrative duties, teaching, research, and service. These personal narratives shall be three (3) to five (5) pages with one-inch margins, standard single-spaced and 10-point minimum font.
- The candidate may also submit evidence of three (3) to five (5) examples of their relevant best work that represent their administrative and/or creative capabilities. These may include reports, published papers, books, software, patents, art productions, or other relevant examples that reflect their superior performance and will be recognized by their peers as such.
- If the candidate has teaching responsibilities, the candidate should provide their own table of student evaluation scores from the Course Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS). The table should include the scores from the question: “Is the instructor an effective teacher?” Other evidence of effective teaching may be provided with the guidance of the supervisor.

- Names of Reviewers. The candidate should provide the names of at least three (3) people who are in a position to evaluate the dossier for promotion. Depending upon the nature of the candidate's responsibilities, these letters may be national, regional, or local.
- Signed Statement of Completeness and Waiver of Access forms provided by the Unit.

External Peer Review

Letters of recommendation. Depending upon the nature of the candidate's responsibilities, these letters may be national, regional, or local. There should be at least three and need not be more than five, but each should address the substance of the candidate's accomplishments and be solicited either by the supervisor or Unit head with an explanation of the criteria for evaluation, as appropriate.

The list of individuals from whom letters are to be obtained should be developed jointly by the candidates for promotion and the supervisor. The final decision regarding who shall be selected to provide recommendations from the list shall rest with the supervisor. It is appropriate to use the same letters for two (2) consecutive years of the process.

A candidate for promotion may request that a particular individual not be contacted as an external reviewer. Such requests are typically honored. If the supervisor concludes that circumstances require use of that reviewer, the letter must be in addition to those normally required, identified as such, and filed separately from the other external letters. A justification for including the letter must be included in the package.

External evaluations shall be solicited by the supervisor or Unit Head and supplied to the other levels of review. These letters shall be solicited with the understanding that, insofar as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion decision.

All candidates will be asked to sign a waiver indicating whether or not candidate “waives all rights to see the identity of the external letter writers and/or the content of their letters”. The waiver form with the candidate’s decision will be included in the package.

Internal Review

Based on the candidate’s dossier and the external letters, the supervisor will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the Unit Head. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate’s experience and performance using the relevant criteria related to their position, a summary of the external letters, and a recommendation for or against promotion. If the promotion also includes a change in or additional professional responsibilities, the change should be described. This letter from the supervisor will be added to the candidate materials and external letters.

The Unit Head will convene a committee which may include tenured faculty as well as academic professionals at or above the rank being considered (the members of the committee may be external to the home unit). Based on the results of an official vote, the committee will send its recommendation to the Unit head describing the rationale of the vote either for or against promotion.

The Unit head will write a letter to the Provost summarizing the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the case and whether he/she recommends promotion or not. In a case in which the supervisor is the Unit Head, for example when the candidate reports directly to the dean of a college, the Unit Head may provide the committee with written guidance that describes what the candidate has accomplished and what there is about the quality of the candidate's work and expertise which warrants promotion at this time. If the promotion also includes a change in or additional professional responsibilities, the change should be described. The Unit Head will write his/her letter to the Provost following the recommendation by the committee.

Institute Review

The Unit Head forwards his or her letter with the completed package to the Provost through the Office of Faculty Affairs for final review. The final outcome of the decision is communicated in writing to the Dean of the College or appropriate Unit Head, who in turn communicates the decision to the faculty member at the end of the review process.

Feedback to Faculty Members

After the final decision has been made and communicated in a letter from the President, It is important for the Faculty member to receive feedback regarding the assessments involved. The appropriate place for the individual Faculty member to receive this feedback is from the supervisor. The supervisor shall receive a copy of the recommendations prepared by the committee and all other reviewers (with the exception of the reviewers' letters). At the end of the review process, the supervisor shall review each recommendation, including his/her own, with the candidate, and counsel the candidate appropriately.

In cases of disapproval of promotion, a candidate shall be counseled concerning the reasons for a negative decision.

The candidate may withdraw his/her promotion package at any time prior to submission of the package to the Office of the Provost.

Detailed Changes (section 3.2.2)

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers

...

Hiring and Reappointment

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.4](#)

Full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are appointed on a year-to-year basis. Since individuals in these positions serve in Instructional Units, procedures for consideration of reappointment are handled by those Units in the same manner as for other Reappointments, as set out in this *Handbook*, Section [3.3.3](#). **Hiring of Lecturers should include letters of recommendations, on-campus interviews, official transcripts, background checks, a job description specific to the appointment, other supporting documentation, request by the Chair and/or Dean, and approval by the Provost.**

... (add following at the end of the section)

Guidelines for Promotion and Evaluation

Lecturers are expected to focus on classroom instruction, but service activities can be part of their duties. The development of original course material and syllabi in line with the learning outcomes of the course(s) may also be part of their duties. Service may be included in the evaluation. Some examples of service may include participation on internal or related external committees, faculty advisor for student organizations, advisor for senior design projects, or other meaningful engagement with the campus community.

Professional development may also be included in the evaluation. Examples of professional development are publication of papers or technical reports, attendance at field-related conferences, incorporation of recent research into courses, attendance at teaching workshop, or creative contributions. Any expectation of service or professional development activities should be outlined in the appointment letter. In rare cases, administrative duties may be assigned as a small percentage of the position responsibilities. However, classroom instruction should account for at least 62% of workload.

Lecturers shall prepare a teaching portfolio which should include all materials for the course(s), self-evaluation, student evaluations, and other related information.

The teaching portfolio will be reviewed as part of the annual evaluation by a committee constituted in each School or College.

In addition to an annual evaluation, Lecturers in their third year will have a third-year review initiated by the Unit head and conducted by the School/College Committee. This review will also be used to determine progress toward promotion to Senior Lecturer. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer may be considered after six (6) years at the Institute. Time in service does not necessarily imply having met the criteria for the next rank simply with the passage of time.

Formal evaluation for promotion should include the teaching portfolio, a current curriculum vitae including service and professional development activities, and letters of recommendation. Materials will be reviewed by a School/College committee. The School/College Committee will submit a letter of support for and the reason for the promotion as well as the official vote to the school chair or dean (depending on if the candidate is at the school or college level). The school chair or dean will write a letter to the Provost summarizing the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the case and whether he/she recommends promotion or not.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires approval by the President.

Senior Lecturers are expected to participate fully in the School/College and at a more robust level than a Lecturer. Their participation may include new course development, service on internal/external committees, research and implementation regarding pedagogy, and/or provide leadership within the School/College.

Senior Lecturers will be evaluated annually.