

3.1.2 Faculty Evaluations and Salaries

3.1.2.1 Annual Evaluations

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 8.3.5.1

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Board of Regents' policies, the Academic and Student Affairs Handbook and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The criteria shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member's institution, school or college, and department, and responsibilities. The criteria shall be submitted to the USG Chief Academic Officer for review and approval.

Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness and student learning as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development across the scope of their responsibilities. In those cases, in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration, and elements of student success) where the individual's major responsibilities lie. While a faculty member's performance evaluation may be deemed as "Not Meeting Expectations" for other reasons, they must be so assessed if a majority of their work responsibilities are assessed as "Not Meeting Expectations".

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all untenured, tenure-track faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure with a focus on the criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions.

The result of the faculty member's annual evaluations will be utilized as a part of subsequent pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews as well as retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

Also see USG policy 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel and USG ASAH sections 4.7 Post-Tenure Review and 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty.

At Georgia Tech, the primary purpose of all performance evaluations is to support each faculty member's career development and performance. Each faculty member shall be evaluated annually.

Evaluation Criteria

Annual performance evaluation will be based solely upon rubrics established by the Institute and the faculty member's unit. Evaluative rubrics, and any changes to these rubrics must be created jointly by faculty and administrators within the framework of faculty governance. Evaluative rubrics, and any changes to these rubrics, must be approved by a vote of the unit's faculty using any applicable unit-level faculty governance procedures.

The annual evaluation will encompass teaching, undergraduate/graduate student success activities, scholarship and creative activities, academic achievement, and professional service to the institution or community. The annual evaluation will consider continuous professional growth and reflect the faculty member's workload percentages, responsibilities, and role. Examples of these activities are contained in 3.3.7.

Faculty Member's Self-Evaluation

The faculty member will conduct a self-evaluation and provide documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. Because the faculty's work is ongoing, cumulative, and long-term in nature, faculty members will report and evaluate themselves annually within the context of the previous three years of performance during each annual review, with emphasis on the most recent year's performance.

Supervisor's Evaluation

The faculty member's appropriate supervisor or unit designee will respond to the faculty member's self-evaluation and assess each criterion as:

1. Does Not Meet Expectations
2. Needs Improvement
3. Meets Expectations
4. Exceeds Expectations
5. Exemplary

The suggested Institute rubrics are presented in 3.1.2.1.1. Each unit is responsible for developing its own rubrics through the framework of faculty governance.

The supervisor's overall evaluation also must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review (or promotion) appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage.

A unit may elect a committee of peers to annually assess faculty in addition to the supervisory assessment. If such a committee annually assesses faculty, the committee will complete its evaluations prior to the supervisor and will share those results with the supervisor. Supervisors should consider the peer committee's input when completing their own evaluations and should share both evaluations with the faculty member.

If a unit utilizes a unit committee for annual performance evaluation, the committee must be elected annually by a vote of the faculty members within the unit. The committee will have a

minimum of three (3) and a maximum of twelve (12) members. Units may establish committee size by faculty vote. The unit's Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) or equivalent for non-academic units shall conduct the election and be the final arbiter of its results.

Annual Evaluation Conference, Signed Acknowledgements, and Responses

The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and their progression towards achieving future milestones.

The supervisor's written response to the faculty member's self-evaluation must be provided to the faculty member within 60 calendar days of the self-evaluation's due date. The faculty member must acknowledge receipt of the supervisor's response with a signature. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond, in writing, within 30 calendar days of the supervisor's and/or the committee's evaluation. Evaluations must notify a faculty member of their right to respond and/or to request the assistance of the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee if the faculty member believes that their rights have been invaded or ignored. If the faculty member submits a response, the supervisor must provide a written reply within 10 business days of the faculty member's response. The supervisor's reply must note changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response.

Performance Remediation Plans

If the faculty member's performance is evaluated as "1 - Does Not Meet Expectations" or "2 - Needs Improvement" on any of the criteria, the supervisor and faculty member will develop a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the remainder of the evaluation period. The PRP must be specific, reasonable, achievable within the time frame, and reflect essential job duties of the faculty member. A PRP must also reflect the timing of a faculty member's contract; remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period.

If the faculty member elects not to collaborate with the supervisor, the supervisor will create an appropriate PRP. In the event of a disagreement between the faculty member and the supervisor concerning the PRP, the plan will be brought before the unit's elected post-tenure review committee (or similar elected committee) for mediation and resolution.

The supervisor will meet with the faculty member twice during the fall semester and twice during the spring semester to review progress, document additional needs and available resources, and plan accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the supervisor will summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. The supervisor must advise the faculty member of the possible consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP during each quarterly meeting.

Annual Evaluation Immediately After Performance Remediation Plan

If the supervisor evaluates a non-tenured faculty member (e.g., untenured tenure track faculty, non-tenure track academic faculty, and research faculty) as “1 - Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2 - Needs Improvement” on any evaluation criterion in the next consecutive annual evaluation, the supervisor may propose a subsequent PRP.

If the supervisor evaluates a tenured faculty member as “1 - Does Not Meet Expectations” or “2 - Needs Improvement” on any evaluation criterion in two consecutive annual evaluations, the supervisor will recommend a corrective post-tenure review. A recommendation for a corrective post-tenure review, and the accompanying annual evaluation, must be reviewed by the unit’s elected post-tenure review committee. If the post-tenure review committee does not agree with the recommendation for a corrective post-tenure review, the matter will be referred to the Dean (or analogous administrator) for determination. If the Dean (or analogous administrator) determines that a corrective post-tenure review is warranted, the committee will submit a written statement of dissent to accompany the Dean’s decision.

Conflict Resolution

Pursuant to 3.1.9, members of the faculty who believe their rights, under the aforementioned provisions, have been invaded or ignored shall have a right to request consideration of their case by the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee.

3.1.2.1.1 Institute Evaluation Scales and Criteria

USG ASAH 4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems:

- Both qualitative and quantitative assessments are acceptable; however, all methods of evaluation should strive for objectivity and reduce subjectivity as much as possible.
- The measure of “Effectiveness in Academic Assigned Duties” should include assessments of both instructional quality and quality learning. Criteria should include measures such as an assessment of student perception, evidence of effective student learning, the use of continuous improvement methodologies, peer assessment of pedagogy, an evaluation of curricular design, quality of assessment and course construction, and the use of established learning science methodologies.

Note for All Rubrics:

- Criteria should be developed for each stage of a faculty member’s career from untenured Assistant Professor, through various levels of promotion, to stages of tenured Full Professor.
- Analogous criteria should also be developed for faculty who serve outside the tenure structure.
- These criteria will provide sufficient guidance to assess whether a faculty member’s performance is appropriate to their stage of professional career development at their institution, college/school, and in their department.
- All categories in the rubrics include student success activities.

Area	USG Likert Scale	USG description	Institute Language
Teaching	5	Exemplary	<p>Exceptional achievements in teaching. Example activities may include, but are not limited to, the following: The individual constructs the course to align with course learning outcomes and uses innovative or evidence-based strategies that lead to exceptional student achievement of these outcomes. The individual designs and facilitates learning experiences that engage students in a positive learning environment and motivates them to master and apply course concepts. Students and peers provide exceptionally positive feedback/high ratings. The individual participates in professional development activities and shares ideas/practices with others.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>
	4	Exceeds Expectations	<p>Substantial achievements in teaching. Example activities may include, but are not limited to, the following: The individual constructs the course to align with course learning outcomes and uses evidence-based strategies to foster student achievement of these outcomes. The individual designs and facilitates learning experiences that engage students in a positive learning environment. Students and peers provide positive feedback/high ratings. The individual participates in professional development activities and shares ideas/practices with others.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>

	3	Meets Expectations	<p>Adequate achievements in teaching. Example activities may include, but are not limited to, the following: The individual constructs the course to align with course learning outcomes and keeps the learner’s perspective in mind. The individual provides evidence of using teaching practices that foster a positive learning environment and that promote student achievement of course outcomes. The individual uses instructional approaches that address or remove barriers to learning and incorporates them throughout the course. The individual shows evidence of attention to continuous improvement and using feedback from students and/or peers and/or involvement in professional development activities to support successful teaching and learning.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>
	2	Needs Improvement	<p>There is little evidence that the individual uses effective instructional practices that promote meaningful student engagement and learning. Issues could involve, but are not limited to, the syllabus/course planning/organization; lack of alignment between course learning outcomes and class activities, assignments, and assessments; lack of timely feedback to students; practices that provide little support for student success or improvement during the course; student ratings and/or peer evaluation that are below departmental norms. While there may be evidence of efforts to improve, there are still concerns about teaching effectiveness.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>

	1	Does not meet Expectations	<p>There is evidence that the teaching provided is not conducive to student learning. Issues could involve, but are not limited to, the syllabus/course planning/organization; lack of alignment between course learning outcomes and class activities, assignments, and assessments; lack of timely feedback to students; practices that contribute to a poor environment for learning. Student ratings and/or peer evaluation are below the department norm. There is little or no demonstration of the individual engaging in efforts to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>
Scholarship and creative activities	5	Exemplary	<p>Exceptional accomplishments in research, scholarship, or creative activities, as evidenced by awards, honors, or significant impact.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>
	4	Exceeds Expectations	<p>Substantial involvement in research, scholarship, or creative activities. Quality and amount of research activity, creativity, or scholarly work is on track for promotion within normal time frame in that discipline or is consistent with this level of productivity in cases where the faculty has already been promoted to the highest possible level.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.</p>
	3	Meets Expectations	<p>Adequate involvement in research, scholarship, or creative activities for this faculty rank.</p> <p>Student success activities may include, but are not</p>

			limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
	2	Needs Improvement	Little evidence of research, scholarship, or creative activities. Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
	1	Does not meet Expectations	No evidence of involvement in research, scholarship, or creative activities. Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
Professional service to the institution or community	5	Exemplary	Exceptional service to the unit, Institute, profession, or community (related to professional experience or expertise) Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
	4	Exceeds Expectations	Substantial service to the unit, Institute, profession, or community (related to professional experience or expertise) Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.

	3	Meets Expectations	Adequate service to the unit, Institute, profession, or community (related to professional experience or expertise) Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
	2	Needs Improvement	Little service to the unit, Institute, profession, or community (related to professional experience or expertise) Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.
	1	Does not meet Expectations	No involvement in service roles (assigned or voluntary). Student success activities may include, but are not limited to, contributions to education and learning (beyond effective teaching); involvement in “high impact practices”; supportive student service activities; mentorship in research; contributions to lifetime, continuing, or professional education; or promoting student health and well-being.

3.1.2.2 Faculty Salaries

Entry Level Salary

Because of the complexity of the Institute, individual Units may have unique missions within the overall Institute mission. The following statements, therefore, are intended to provide a framework within which individual units develop specific criteria appropriate for their discipline.

The salary level associated with each faculty position shall be based upon the requirements of the position and the qualifications of the individual employed to fill the position. The qualifications of the individual shall include academic degrees earned, teaching and other relevant experience, scholarship and creative activities, academic achievements and honors, and relevant professional achievements and recognition.

In addition to personal qualifications, consideration will be given to "marketplace" factors such as availability (supply and demand) of qualified individuals, salaries offered by competitors (industry and other academic institutions) for individuals, and the intensity of the Institute's need for these individuals.

Merit Increases

Merit increases for full-time Faculty shall be based on an evaluation of job assignment and overall productivity. All dimensions of the faculty member's role shall be considered, although weights assigned may vary across disciplines and even within a discipline, depending on the job assignment of the individual and on the needs of the Unit. In evaluating a faculty member's performance, careful consideration will be given to the quality of the individual's contributions in instruction (classroom-related and individual supervision), scholarship and creative activities, service (to students, the academic community, the Institute, the discipline, and the external community), and student success activities.

3.2 Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The Institute is authorized to establish professional positions designated as non-tenure track positions. The Institute shall prepare annually, along with its budget, a list of positions so designated for submission to and approval by the Chancellor or his/her designee. Positions designated as non-tenure track positions or as tenure track positions may be converted to the other type only with approval by the President.

Non-tenure track positions may be established for full-time professional personnel employed in administrative positions or to staff research, educational, technical, special, career, and public service programs or programs which are anticipated to have a limited lifespan or which are funded, fully or partially, through non-System sources. Some positions will have membership in the Research Faculty and some in Academic Faculty. There shall be no maximum time limitation for service in positions in this category.

The following provisions shall apply to all non-tenure track professional personnel:

- Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure;
- Probationary credit toward tenure shall not be awarded for service in non-tenure track positions, except for lecturers and senior lecturers;
- Notice of intention to renew or not to renew contracts of non-tenure track personnel who are members of the Academic Faculty shall follow the schedule required for tenure track personnel. This schedule of notification shall not apply to other professional personnel; and
- Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may apply on an equal basis with other candidates for tenure track positions which may become available.

The transfer of individuals from tenure-track positions to non-tenure track positions shall be effected on a voluntary basis only.

All promotion reviews for Non-Tenure Track faculty must utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 — Does Not Meet Expectations**
- 2 — Needs Improvement**
- 3 — Meets Expectations**
- 4 — Exceeds Expectations**
- 5 — Exemplary**

Noteworthy achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the above Likert scale.

3.2.1 Research Faculty: Hiring and Promotion Guidelines

Research Faculty members are not eligible for tenure. While they are subject to many of the general hiring and promotion criteria for tenure-track Faculty, there are significant differences. The following sections detail established positions in the Research Faculty and their promotion criteria.

Titles

Research Faculty titles include:

- Research Scientist
- Research Engineer
- Research Technologist
- Research Associate
- Extension Professional

A person is normally hired into a Scientist, Engineer, Technologist, Associate, or Extension Professional position, where appropriate, on the basis of the field of their most recent educational degree or their experience. Standards of evaluation will generally be based on the standards of that field. There are levels of I, II, Senior, and Principal for each of these titles.

Research Associate Titles

The title of Research Associate is held by research personnel who meet all normal requirements, but for whom the title of Engineer, Scientist, or Technologist is not appropriate. The title is intended for professionals for whom a specific need exists, but because of the different nature of their education or experience, should not be classified (at least initially) in the Research Engineer/Scientist/Technologist structures. In determining when it will be suitable to use the Research Associate title structure, reliance will be placed on comparison with the established criteria for Research Engineer/Scientist/Technologist. That is, the qualifications for Research Associate should have an equivalency to Research Engineer/Scientist/Technologist, but will differ in some particular aspect. In general, it will offer more flexibility in considering the candidate's total qualifications and suitability for employment at Georgia Tech. The title is intended to be broad enough in scope to include any professional categories appropriate to the Institute's needs. Examples include medical doctors, health and safety professionals, social scientists, architects, and management experts.

Extension Professional Titles

The title of Extension Professional is held by research personnel that fulfill the extension and service mission of Georgia Tech to the State of Georgia and beyond. This mission includes, but is not limited to, technology-based economic development, technology commercialization and deployment, entrepreneurship, start-up company incubation, and business and industry outreach. Extension Professionals also provide educational programs for business and industry in support of these missions and facilitate and foster increased industrial engagement and sponsorship of applied research activities with Georgia Tech.

Extension Professional appointments are made on the basis of merit and the special qualifications of the individual and follow the same general ranking, hiring, and promotion principles as the other professional research faculty ranks. Extension Professional ranks include the same levels as for the other titles above. Promotion criteria, including education and time in rank, shall follow the research titles as outlined in the following section; however, equivalent extension impacts and accomplishments versus research accomplishments will be considered by the promotion review boards.

Promotion to a Higher Rank

Following are normal requirements for consideration for promotion to a higher rank. These experience and performance criteria may also be used for determining the initial rank when hiring professional research personnel. Credit for previous academic or research professional experience should be explicitly stated in writing at the time of employment. In addition to these criteria, to be considered for promotion will normally require a number of years in rank, as follows:

- Research Scientist II – Three (3) years as Research Scientist I
- Senior Research Scientist – Four (4) years as Research Scientist II
 - For candidates holding the Doctoral degree, employment prior to employment at Georgia Tech will be considered if adequately documented, and the four-year time in rank requirement reduced to two (2) years for candidates so qualified. Employment prior to Georgia Tech plus employment at Georgia Tech must be four years or more with a minimum of two (2) years in rank at Georgia Tech.
- Principal Research Scientist - Five (5) years as Senior Research Scientist

As used in this *Handbook*, "years of experience," "years in rank," and "years at Georgia Tech" are to be calculated as of July 1st of the year in which the promotion would take effect. Note: In the above and following sections, the term "Research Scientist" is used to indicate any one of the following: Research Scientist, Research Engineer, Research Technologist, Research Associate, or Extension Professional.

The following sections describe the credentials, competency, and performance expected of the identified ranks. Requirements for professional registration and other legal or professional certification are not identified in these guidelines as prerequisites for promotion. Instead, these

formal evidences of competency are expected to be provided by persons assigned to duties that require them.

Research Scientist I

This is the initial rank held by research personnel who have at least a bachelor's degree and who will be performing on a professional level.

Research Scientist II

In addition to the [years-in-rank requirement](#), this rank requires one (1) of the following:

- A Master's degree and three (3) years of relevant full-time experience after completion of that degree,
- A Master's degree and five (5) years of relevant full-time experience after completion of a Bachelor's degree, or
- A Doctoral degree.

Qualified candidates who are recommended by the normal administrative process will not be reviewed by a Presidential committee. Professional recognition in one's research field will be expected.

In addition to the candidate's education and experience, the promotion recommendation shall include substantive evidence of the candidate's progress toward developing the capabilities for performing at the level expected of research professionals in the same field holding senior Research Faculty ranks at Georgia Tech. Such evidence might consist of papers published or contributed to, significant managerial efforts on sponsored projects, products developed and delivered to the sponsor community such as software or hardware and documented impacts of these products, or equivalent teaching responsibilities performed in an instructional unit.

Senior Research Scientist

In addition to the [years-in-rank requirement](#), this rank requires one (1) of the following:

- A Master's degree and seven (7) years of relevant full-time experience after completion of that degree,
- A Master's degree and nine (9) years of relevant full-time experience after completion of a Bachelor's degree, or
- A Doctoral degree and four (4) years of relevant full-time experience after completion of a Bachelor's degree.

The rank of Senior Research Scientist is reserved for those professionals who have demonstrated a level of scholarly achievement and technical, managerial, and entrepreneurial productivity commensurate with the highest standards of Georgia Tech. Achievements should

include recognized contributions to their specific technical disciplines; supervision of other research professionals through review and approval of proposals, technical reports and other communications; and representation of Georgia Tech to external organizations for the purpose of obtaining, managing, and performing high-quality sponsored research programs. Preference will be shown for qualified personnel holding a Doctoral degree in their specified discipline.

In addition to the basic requirements, above, demonstrated superior performance of professional duties is required as follows:

- A. Peer recognition of mastery of a complex and difficult field of specialization as demonstrated through authorship of refereed papers and/or products developed and delivered to the sponsor community such as software or hardware, and documented impacts of these products. The latter may come in the form of sponsor satisfaction testimonials. While emphasis will be given to authorship of journal and symposium papers which have been refereed, recognition will also be given to contributions to other journals, organizational publications, widely distributed reports which effect an education and technology information transfer; and at least two (2) of the following B through E.
- B. Important technical contributions and innovation as documented in formal reports of several projects over a minimum time of four (4) years prior to recommendation for promotion.
- C. Supervision of others' work by virtue of being a program manager, project director/principal investigator, co-project director/principal investigator, or task leader on sponsored research of such magnitude as to require guidance and supervision of other professionals.
- D. Substantial documented contributions in sponsored program development.
- E. Superior ability in representing the School/Center/Laboratory/Georgia Tech in service to and dealings with outside organizations.

Principal Research Scientist

In addition to the [years-in-rank requirement](#), this rank requires either:

- A Master's degree and eleven (11) years' relevant full-time experience; or
- A Doctoral degree and seven (7) years' relevant full-time experience.

At least the most recent three (3) years of relevant experience shall have been at a responsible technical or managerial level. Preference will be shown for qualified personnel holding a Doctoral degree in their specific discipline.

In addition to the basic requirements above, the candidate for the rank of Principal Research Scientist must be outstanding in item A below and have demonstrated outstanding capabilities in at least two (2) of the research or service activities B through D:

- A. Clear evidence of consistent performance in the making of original and innovative contributions that are nationally recognized for their excellence as documented by external peer review. At least three (3) letters of evaluation must be obtained by the Institute from highly qualified persons in the candidate's professional field who are not employed by the Institute.
- B. Leadership in developing and managing a technical thrust involving related projects. Special consideration will be given to programs involving a broad participation by research and instructional Faculty and Students.
- C. Substantial contributions to Georgia Tech by service to the Institute, the State, the Nation, or to the candidate's profession.
- D. Broad recognition of technical stature as evidenced by invited papers or seminars, session chairperson at national symposia, memberships on national committees, offices in professional societies, or other appropriate honors.

Joint Appointments in Instructional Units

Instances may arise where it is appropriate for a Research Faculty member not in an Instructional Unit to receive a joint appointment to such a Department. See Section [3.3.1](#) concerning Joint Appointments.

3.2.2 Non-Tenure Track Academic Faculty Members: Hiring and Promotion Guidelines

While persons holding the positions detailed under the following headings are members of the Academic Faculty, they are not eligible for tenure. While they are subject to many of the general hiring and promotion criteria for tenure-track Faculty, there are significant differences. The following sections identify non-tenure track positions in the Academic Faculty and their promotion criteria.

Professor of the Practice

The position of Professor of the Practice is for qualified academic, business, or government leaders. Due to the stature of individuals to be offered this position, the category will have only one rank: Professor of the Practice.

The qualifications are:

- Have substantial bases of experience, normally at least ten (10) to fifteen (15) years, and a national/international reputation for excellence.
- Have rich and extensive backgrounds in fields and disciplines related to the school or college of appointment at the Institute.

And expectations for this position are:

- Will serve as liaisons between industry or government and the Institute in identifying teaching and research opportunities that support the public interest and societal needs.
- May be expected (depending on circumstances of their appointment) to generate financial resources to support and enhance the Institute programs in which they work.

The guidelines for implementation are:

- General duties and responsibilities must be agreed upon in advance with each Professor of the Practice and their Chair, Dean or Unit Head. And documented in their letter of appointment.
- Appointments as Professor of the Practice may be full-time or part-time. Eligibility for fringe and retirement benefits will conform to Georgia Tech employment policies.
- “Professor of the Practice” is a non-tenurable title which is consistent with Board of Regents provisions for “Non-Tenure Track Personnel”. This classification carries with it membership in the Academic Faculty of the Institute.

- The position may be described as “Professor of the Practice of X,” where X is an academic discipline or specialty. For communications purposes, a Professor of the Practice may represent himself or herself with a shorter title as “Professor of X.”
- Professors of the Practice will be reappointed annually but with no limit as to the number of years that may be served.
- Professors of the Practice will participate in an annual evaluation, as is regularly conducted for tenure track Faculty. Performance will be evaluated during this annual review, with actions and recommendations made as appropriate.
- During the term of their appointment, Professors of the Practice are subject to, and protected by, the same Institute policies concerning academic freedom as tenured and tenure track Faculty.
- Funding sources for Professors of the Practice may include the Institute, College, School, or Center, or some combination of these, and the funds may consist in whole or part of funds generated by the individual.
- Schools, Colleges and Units at the Institute have considerable latitude in developing complementary policies and procedures for Professors of the Practice as long as they are consistent with overall policies detailed in this Section.
- The Institute and its Schools, Colleges and Units will adopt appointment and reappointment policies. At minimum, these policies will involve letters of recommendation concerning the individual being proposed for a position as Professor of the Practice, on-campus interviews of the candidate, input into the decision by a body of the faculty in the School or College or Unit, recommendation of the Chair and/or Dean or Unit Head, and approval by the Provost. Faculty involvement in the decision to hire should be identical to those procedures used for hiring tenured Professors.

Academic Professionals

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.8.4](#).

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 following stipulations apply to all Academic Professional positions:

- The position requires an appropriate terminal degree, or in rare and extraordinary circumstances, qualification on the basis of demonstrably successful related experience, which exception is expressly approved by the President;
- The Academic Professional designation may not be assigned to a position where the teaching and research responsibilities total 50% or more of the total assignment; and

- The position is not a tenure-track position, and the holder of the position is not eligible for consideration for the award of tenure, or for probationary credit toward tenure.

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, but are not limited to, the following:

- instructional laboratory management,
- academic program management,
- program development and coordination,
- program evaluation and assessment,
- operating instructional technology support programs,
- responsibility for general academic advising,
- providing services or co-curricular educational opportunities for students,
- professional student counseling center responsibilities,
- providing specialized skill acquisition training as support for academic programs,
- course, laboratory, and curriculum development, and
- course delivery.

Academic Professionals at any rank will be evaluated annually.

Reappointment of Academic Professionals is made annually. Notice of non-reappointment must be made in a timely manner consistent with Board of Regents policy, using the three-, six-, and nine-month notification schedule depending upon length of service in the position, as outlined in the Notice subsection of [3.3.3](#).

Criteria or guidelines for reappointment in Academic Professional ranks generally follow those established for Instructional Units as set out in Section [3.3.3](#). Additional criteria may be established by the President in consultation with the Faculty Executive Board and shall be published and distributed to the Faculty.

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. 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.

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.

Minimum expectations for promotion in all Academic Professional ranks should be based on the five (5) criteria listed below. The candidate must demonstrate noteworthy achievement in number one (effective administration) and two of the others.

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

Each Unit is expected to establish clear guidelines and examples based on these promotion criteria and the mission of that Unit. These guidelines should be easily accessible to all faculty.

As part of the promotion process, the supervisor should submit a written recommendation setting forth the reasons and justification, based on the above criteria, 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.

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, review, and submit all required documentation and materials, 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.

- A *curriculum vitae* that summarizes biographical, personal, and professional data using the Institute standard format for academic professionals.
- 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 be in the Institute standard format and 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, including student success activities.
- 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.
- Signed Statement of Completeness and Waiver of Access forms provided by the Unit.

External Peer Review

Letters of evaluation. 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 be from an evaluator outside of the unit (i.e., outside of the college, vice provost, or vice president's unit), 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. At least one (1) letter of evaluation should be from an individual external to the Institute for promotion to Academic Professional or Senior Academic Professional and at least two (2) should be external to Georgia Tech for promotion to Principal Academic Professional.

The list of individuals from whom letters are to be obtained shall be developed jointly by the candidate for promotion and the supervisor. The final decision regarding who is selected to provide evaluations 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 shall have the right to 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 on campus. 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 an elected Faculty 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 USG Human Resources Administrative Manual Employee Relations Grievance Policy states that a grievance is not available to dispute promotion decisions. Therefore, only the processes through which promotion decisions are made can be appealed to the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee (FSGC) (See “Grievance: Process and Procedures,” Section 3.1.9). The FSGC’s findings regarding appeals on promotion decisions are limited to recommendations to the President. Such recommendations may include the candidate resubmitting their promotion materials the following year without penalty.

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

Lecturers

Full-Time Lecturers

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.8.1 and 8.3.8.2](#)

To carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction, the Institute may appoint instructional staff members to the position of Lecturer. Lecturers at any rank are not eligible for the award of tenure. Reappointment of a lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to the Institute will be permitted only if the lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the Institute. The reappointment process must follow Institute procedures. Not more than twenty (20) percent of the Institute’s FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction may be Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers.

Senior and Principal Lecturers

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

The titles of Senior Lecturer and Principal Lecturer may be used at the discretion of the Institute. The Institute is discouraged from initial hiring at the Senior and Principal Lecturer levels. Both Senior and Principal Lecturers are expected to participate fully in the School/College and at a more robust level than Lecturers. Their participation may include new course development, service on internal/external committees, research and implementation regarding pedagogy, and/or leadership within the School/College. In addition to time in rank at the Senior Lecturer level, Principal Lecturers also are expected to show more leadership and educational impact than a Senior Lecturer and their participation may include cutting-edge pedagogical practices and/or leadership within the Institute.

Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six (6) years at the Institute may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Senior Lecturers who have served for a period of

at least five (5) years in rank at the Institute may be considered for promotion to Principal Lecturer. Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer requires approval by the President.

Hiring and Reappointment

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

Full-time Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers are appointed on a year-to-year basis and reappointment procedures are the same at all ranks. 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 at all ranks 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.

Lecturers of all ranks who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as follows:

- For Lecturers of all ranks with less than three (3) years of full-time service, the Institute shall provide non-reappointment notice as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.
- For Lecturers of all ranks with three (3) or more years but less than six (6) years of full-time service, the Institute must provide non-reappointment notice at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.
- For Lecturers of all ranks with six (6) years or more of full-time service, the Institute must provide non-reappointment notice at least one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.

Lecturers of all ranks with six (6) or more years of full-time service who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with the procedures in this *Handbook*. For additional appeal procedures see Section VIII of the *Bylaws of the Board of Regents*.

In no case will service as a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal lecturer imply any claim upon tenure or reappointment under conditions other than those above.

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 a majority of the workload for lecturers of all ranks.

Lecturers must also be evaluated on their achievements in student success activities as evidenced by activities within teaching and instruction, academic achievement, and service. Activities that faculty members perform that contribute to student success encompass a wide spectrum of formal and informal interactions with students. Some examples of student success activities include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities to deepen student learning. Faculty members are to be evaluated on their student success activities that are relevant to their job responsibilities and roles. Faculty members are afforded the discretion to determine the student success activities that they undertake; however, as required by the Board of Regents, faculty members must report their activities, and evaluations must use the scale outlined in the USG Academic and Faculty Affairs Handbook. For the purposes of promotion, faculty members must provide a narrative statement documenting their student success activities.

Lecturers at any rank will be evaluated annually and should demonstrate excellence in teaching. Each unit is expected to establish a set of clearly defined criteria for promotion defined in accordance with the mission of that Unit. These criteria should be easily accessible to all faculty.

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

The teaching portfolio will be reviewed as part of the evaluation processes by an elected Faculty committee constituted in each School and/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. Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer may be considered after five (5) years in rank as a Senior Lecturer. Time in service at any rank 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 a minimum of three (3) letters of evaluation external to the unit. At least one evaluation letter should be from an individual external to the Institute; for promotion to Principal Lecturer, at least two letters should be from individuals external to the Institute.

Materials will be reviewed by an elected 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 or Principal Lecturer requires approval by the President.

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 USG Human Resources Administrative Manual Employee Relations Grievance Policy states that a grievance is not available to dispute promotion decisions. Therefore, only the processes through which promotion decisions are made can be appealed to the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee (FSGC) (See "Grievance: Process and Procedures," Section 3.1.9). The FSGC's findings regarding appeals on promotion decisions are limited to recommendations to the President. Such recommendations may include the candidate resubmitting their promotion materials the following year without penalty.

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

Instructors

A person hired with the academic rank of Instructor is not eligible for tenure under Board of Regents policies. They are, however, afforded the same expectations and procedures for

reappointment as set out in this *Handbook* in Section [3.3.3](#). The maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time Instructor shall be seven (7) years.

Librarians and Archivists

Georgia Tech Library is a member of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), a nonprofit organization of over 120 research libraries at comprehensive, research institutions in Canada and the US that share similar research missions, aspirations and achievements. Georgia Tech Librarians and Archivists follow similar guidelines and practices as other ARL member libraries where librarians and archivists are non-tenured track faculty.

The position of Librarian or Archivist is for qualified individuals within the Georgia Tech Library who provide complex information services to:

(a) ensure students and faculty have necessary information resources; (b) teach students information and data literacy to ensure that they become proficient life-long learners; (c) support and facilitate faculty in their teaching and research endeavors. Librarians or Archivists may focus on one or more areas within the information lifecycle, which encompasses information creation, selection, acquisition, organization, retrieval, access, dissemination, discovery, evaluation, display, and preservation. For example, a cataloging librarian is involved primarily in information organization, access, and discovery. A digital scholarship librarian concentrates on information creation, organization, and dissemination. An instruction librarian's job centers on information retrieval, dissemination, and evaluation; and an archivist focuses on information preservation and access.

Career ladders are established for Librarians and Archivists, using the following titles: Librarian/Archivist I, Librarian/Archivist II, Librarian/Archivist III, and Librarian/Archivist IV. Eligibility for promotion consideration is based on (a) years of service as a Librarian/Archivist at the current rank; (b) years of professional experience as a Librarian/Archivist in general; and (c) a mandatory 3rd year review. Years of service is calculated based on the Georgia Tech fiscal year. A Librarian/Archivist's first year of service at Georgia Tech starts on July 1 of the calendar year when the Librarian/Archivist is employed on or before October 15. Otherwise, a Librarian/Archivist's first year of service at Georgia Tech starts on July 1 of the following calendar year. A Librarian/Archivist at any rank must submit their dossier for a mandatory 3rd year review at the beginning of their 3rd year of service at the Library.

Librarians/Archivists are expected to, first and foremost, excel in their positions held at Georgia Tech. As a result, the vast majority of their time should be spent on carrying out assigned duties within the Library. The rest of a Librarian/Archivist's time should be distributed equally to scholarship and service. Service typically include service to the Library, Institute, and the library profession which are beyond those mandated by the individual's primary job responsibilities. Exceptions to this typical effort distribution should be documented in writing, acknowledged by the Librarian/Archivist, their supervisor and the Dean of Libraries. The primary indicator of

excellence is impact. As a librarian/archivist approaches higher ranks, demonstrated impact beyond the Institution is expected.

Librarians/Archivists at any rank will be evaluated annually.

Reappointment of Librarians and Archivists is made annually. Notification of non-reappointment must be made in a timely manner consistent with Board of Regents policy, using the three-, six-, and nine-month notification schedule depending upon length of service in the position, as outlined in the Notice subsection of 3.3.3.

Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion

Librarian/Archivist I. This is an entry-level rank. Individuals are not permitted to remain at this rank permanently. A Librarian/Archivist I must submit their dossier for promotion review, at the latest, by the end of their fourth year of service at Librarian/Archivist I rank at Georgia Tech Library. Appointment to this rank requires an appropriate terminal degree, typically an American Library Association (ALA) - accredited master's degree, a degree in a subject related to archival work, and/or in the appropriate area of specialization. Additional expertise and/or experience may be required for specific positions. Up to two (2) years credit for previous professional experience at this level may be given at the time of employment, in which case such credit must be stated in the offer letter.

Librarian/Archivist II. This is an intermediate rank. Individuals can stay at this rank permanently. This rank requires an appropriate terminal degree, typically an American Library Association (ALA) - accredited master's degree, a degree in a subject related to archival work, and/or in the appropriate area of specialization. It also requires consistent and solid performance in primary job functions, with evidence showing the individual's ability to fulfill the strategic goals of the Library and the Institute. Either evidence of scholarship or evidence of service is required, but not both. Evidence of scholarship or evidence of service should be commensurate with effort distribution. Promotion to the rank of Librarian/Archivist II also requires at least five (5) years of service at the Librarian/Archivist I rank. Up to two (2) years credit for previous professional experience at this level may be given at the time of employment, in which case such credit must be stated in the offer letter.

Librarian/Archivist III. This is an intermediate rank. Individuals can stay at this rank permanently. This rank requires an appropriate terminal degree, typically an American Library Association (ALA) - accredited master's degree, a degree in a subject related to archival work, and/or in the appropriate area of specialization. It also requires superior performance in primary job functions, demonstrated by significant contributions to the Library, Institute, and profession. The quality of performance and impact must be recognized by peers through at least two (2), but no more than five (5) external review letters. A strong record of both scholarship and service is required. Evidence of scholarship and evidence of service should be commensurate with effort distribution. Promotion to the rank of Librarian/Archivist III also requires at least five (5) years of service at the Librarian/Archivist II rank and at least ten (10)

years of professional experience in general. Up to two years credit for previous professional experience at this level may be given at the time of employment, in which case such credit must be stated in the offer letter.

Librarian/Archivist IV. This is the highest rank that individuals can achieve at the Library. This rank requires an appropriate terminal degree, typically an American Library Association (ALA) - accredited master's degree, a degree in a subject related to archival work, and/or in the appropriate area of specialization. It also requires longstanding leadership in consistently improving and innovating library services, broadening the impact of library programs, and strengthening the Institute's reputation. Individuals at this level maintain the highest standards of professional practice, and their outstanding contributions to the Library, Institute, and profession are recognized widely as verified by peers through at least three (3) but no more than five (5) external review letters. A record of excellence in both scholarship and service is required. Evidence of scholarship and evidence of service should be commensurate with effort distribution. Promotion to the rank of Librarian/Archivist IV also requires at least five (5) years of service at Georgia Tech Library at the Librarian/Archivist III rank and at least fifteen (15) years of professional experience in general.

Promotion Procedures

Candidate's Responsibility

Preparation of the promotion dossier is the responsibility of the candidate in consultation with their supervisor. The candidate has the responsibility to prepare, review, and submit all required documentation and materials, with the exception of external evaluation letters. When the documentation is complete and in the proper format, the candidate will sign a statement that the dossier is both accurate and complete.

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

The candidate's promotion dossier should include at a minimum the following information:

- Coversheet
- Biosketch
- Current position description
- Personal narrative
- Curriculum vitae
- CV addendum or updates (if applicable)
- Teaching and training assessment (if applicable)
- Statement of Completeness
- Waiver of Access form
- List of five (5) potential external reviewers (if applicable)
- Examples of relevant creative work

The candidate may withdraw their promotion package at any time prior to receipt of the final decision by the Provost.

External Peer Review

For promotion to Librarian/Archivist III and Librarian/Archivist IV, external letters of evaluation are required. A minimum of two (2) letters, of which at least one (1) letter should be from an individual external to the Institute, must be included in each dossier for promotion to Librarian/Archivist III. A minimum of three (3) letters, of which at least two (2) should be from individuals external to the Institute, must be included in each dossier for promotion to Librarian/Archivist IV.

The supervisor (and/or appropriate associate dean) and candidate should jointly develop the list of five (5) potential external reviewers, and submit the list to the Library Faculty Review Committee, which will request the letters of review using the External Review Request Letter Template.

All candidates will be asked to sign a waiver indicating whether or not the 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 dossier.

Internal Review

Each candidate’s dossier must go through the following stages of internal review before reaching the Provost for a decision.

1. First-level Review – Supervisor and/or Associate Dean. Based on the candidate’s dossier, the supervisor will provide a letter of evaluation addressed to the Dean of Libraries. This letter should provide an analysis of the candidate’s experience and performance using the relevant criteria related to their position. If the supervisor is not an Associate Dean, an appropriate Associate Dean may comment briefly (one paragraph) on the supervisor’s letter to either agree or disagree with the supervisor’s evaluation. This letter from the supervisor will be added to the candidate’s dossier.
2. Library Faculty Review Committee. The Dean of Libraries will convene the review committee(s) of elected faculty members, which may include faculty members from outside the Library at the Professor or Principal level for non-tenure track faculty. After deliberations, the committee will conduct an official vote, record the vote on the coversheet, and describe the rationale of the vote in a recommendation letter addressed to the Dean of Libraries. This letter should include the date of deliberation and the vote. Where the vote is split, the views of members who voted with the minority should be represented in the letter if at all possible. Any conflicts of interest addressed in the committee’s work should also be described. This letter from the Library Faculty Review Committee will be added to the candidate’s dossier.

3. Dean of Libraries. The Dean of Libraries will write a letter to the Provost summarizing the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the case and where the Dean agrees with or differs from the previous levels of review. The Dean's recommendation is recorded in the letter and on the coversheet. This letter from the Dean of Libraries will be added to the candidate's dossier.

Institute Review

Institute Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Review Committee. The Dean of Libraries will forward the completed dossier to the Provost through the Office of Faculty Affairs for final review by the Institute Non-Tenure Track Promotion Committee and the Provost. The final outcome of the decision is communicated in writing to the Dean of Libraries, who in turn communicates the decision to the candidate at the end of the review process.

Feedback to Faculty Members

After the final promotion decision has been made and communicated in writing to the candidate through the Dean of Libraries, it is important for the faculty member to receive additional feedback regarding the assessments received. The candidate's supervisor will also receive a copy of the recommendations prepared by the Institute Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion Review Committee and all other reviewers (with the exception of any external peer review letters). At the end of the review process, the supervisor will review each recommendation, including their own, with the candidate, and counsel the candidate appropriately.

In cases of denial of promotion, the candidate will be counseled concerning the reasons for the negative decision.

The USG Human Resources Administrative Manual Employee Relations Grievance Policy states that a grievance is not available to dispute promotion decisions. Therefore, only the processes through which promotion decisions are made can be appealed to the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee (FSGC) (See "Grievance: Process and Procedures," Section 3.1.9). The FSGC's findings regarding appeals on promotion decisions are limited to recommendations to the President. Such recommendations may include the candidate resubmitting their promotion materials the following year without penalty.

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

3.3 Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Under Board of Regents policies, only Academic Faculty members in the professorial ranks can be Tenured or in the Tenure Track (i.e., eligible to be considered for tenure). Tenure is granted only to a Faculty member whose home Unit is an Instructional Unit.

-
- [3.3.1 Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments](#)
 - [3.3.2 Salary Determinations for Tenure-Track Faculty](#)
 - [3.3.3 Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty without Tenure](#)
 - [3.3.4 Tenure and Promotion Overview](#)
 - [3.3.5 Tenure](#)
 - [3.3.6 Promotion](#)
 - [3.3.7 Promotion and Tenure Evaluation](#)
 - [3.3.8 Promotion and Tenure Procedures](#)
 - [3.3.9 Periodic Peer Review Policy](#)
 - [3.3.10 Process for 5-Year Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of School Chairs](#)
 - [3.3.11 Process for 5-Year Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of Deans of Academic Units](#)
-

3.3.1 Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments

Recommendations on appointment of a Faculty member having professorial rank shall ordinarily originate within the relevant Instructional Units and shall be presented through the prescribed channels to the President. Appointments shall become final upon approval by the President.

Procedures for recommending reappointment, promotion, or tenure of Faculty members shall adhere to the following criteria:

- Recommendations by the Unit Head, Dean of the College, and the Provost shall be essential elements.
- Recommendations by Faculty committees at the School and College levels are essential elements. They shall elect their own Chairs and shall function in a manner that allows independent judgment. Written committee recommendations shall be transmitted to the appropriate administrative officials.
- The Provost shall consult with selected senior Faculty members before making recommendations to the President.

Qualifications

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Sections [8.3.1.2](#) and [8.3.1.3](#)

Minimum employment qualifications for all academic ranks within the Institute shall be:

- Consistent with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' requirements for institutional accreditation,
- Evidence of ability as a teacher,
- Evidence of ability and activity as a scholar in all other aspects of duties assigned,
- Successful experience (this must necessarily be waived in the case of those just entering the academic profession who meet all other requirements),
- Desirable personal qualities judged on the basis of personal interview, complete biographical data, and recommendations, and
- Consistent with Board of Regents policy for Research Universities, initial appointees to the associate or full professorial rank should have the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline or equivalent in training, ability, or experience.

Evidence of current academic credentials (or equivalents) shall be maintained by the Institute for all Faculty members, including any part time, temporary, or visiting instructors.

Hiring with Probationary Credit

A maximum of three years of probationary credit towards promotion may be awarded for service at other institutions or service in a faculty rank within the Institute can be established only at the time of the individual's initial appointment. In extraordinary cases, more than three years of probationary credit towards promotion at initial faculty appointment may be awarded, but such awards require approval by the President and written notification to the USG Chief Academic Officer. Without the approval of the President, faculty given probationary credit towards promotion may not use their years of credit towards consideration for early promotion.

Individuals serving in part-time, limited term, or full-time temporary positions are not eligible for probationary credit toward tenure or probationary credit towards promotion.

Hiring with Tenure

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Handbook, in exceptional cases the Georgia Institute of Technology may recommend to the Board of Regents that an outstanding distinguished senior Faculty member be awarded tenure upon the Faculty member's initial

appointment. Each such recommendation shall be considered by the Board individually and shall be granted only in cases in which the Faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an Associate or Professor, was already tenured at a prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national or international reputation to Georgia Tech.

Procedures

In cases where an Instructional Unit of Georgia Tech wishes to pursue hiring with tenure, the following procedures should be followed:

- The Academic Head (Dean/Chair) responsible for the hire should prepare a written letter making the case for hiring with tenure. This letter, along with a complete Biographical Sketch or curriculum vitae detailing the relevant career activities of the individual should be forwarded to a committee of the Faculty for review.
- A committee of the Faculty should review the qualifications of the candidate, and render a consultative vote as to whether the candidate should be hired with tenure. This committee may be a standing Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) committee within the unit or an ad hoc committee of the Faculty organized to review the case for tenure upon appointment. Members of an ad hoc committee must meet the Instructional Unit's qualifications to sit on an RPT committee in that Unit. In any case, the committee members should be elected by the Unit's faculty. The committee should review all of the application materials submitted by the candidate, and may request additional materials (e.g., written letters of reference).
- The Faculty committee should use the appropriate criteria for appointment and tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor as established in this Handbook and as may be further specified within the unit considering the candidate.
- The committee should prepare a written letter to the Academic Head of the Instructional Unit and record its vote on the case for tenure on appointment.
- The letter from the Academic Head (Dean/Chair) and the letter from the Faculty committee should be forwarded to the Provost and Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs for his/her review and final determination whether the Institute will petition the Board of Regents for tenure upon appointment.

Joint Appointments

Joint appointments must involve a budgetary commitment to the individual by each Unit. Normally, this would involve teaching and/or research activity. Each Faculty member with a

joint appointment should have a Home Unit which has responsibility for administrative activity for the individual. Promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions should involve all affected Units.

Instances may arise where it is appropriate for a research titled Faculty member who is not in an Instructional Unit to have a joint appointment in an Instructional Unit. Such arrangements are to be encouraged where they work to the advantage of all parties concerned. The head of the Instructional Unit in which the joint appointment is held will be expected to supply letters of evaluation for all promotion/salary decisions. Tenure is not awarded to persons whose home unit is not an Instructional Unit.

3.3.3 Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty without Tenure

General Principles

All non-tenured Tenure-Track Faculty who have been awarded academic rank (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor), are employed under written contract, and who served full-time for the entire previous year have the presumption of renewal for the next academic year unless notified in writing, by the President, of the Institute's intent not to renew. Instructors are not eligible for tenure but have the same expectations and procedures for reappointment as the above.

Notice (*Board of Regents Policy Manual* [8.3.4.2](#))

Written notice of intent not to renew shall be delivered by hand or by certified mail, return-receipt requested.

Notice of intention not to renew shall be given according to the following schedule:

- At least three (3) months before the date of termination of an initial one-year contract.
- At least six (6) months before the date of termination of a second one-year contract.
- At least nine (9) months before the date of termination of a contract after two (2) or more years of service in the institution.

This schedule does not apply to persons holding temporary, limited-term, or part-time positions, or persons with courtesy appointments such as adjunct appointments.

Recommendations of non-reappointment made to the President may be referred by him for consideration and recommendation to the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee.

Procedures on Reappointment

Administrative Reviews

Tenure-track faculty without tenure shall be evaluated annually by their Unit Head(s). These annual reviews of tenure-track faculty without tenure shall encompass the following: a) teaching; b) student success activities, as evidenced by activities within teaching and instruction, academic achievement, and service; c) research/scholarship; d) professional service; and e) professional growth appropriate to the Institute, college, or school. All administrative reviews must utilize the following Likert scale:

1 — Does Not Meet Expectations

- 2 — Needs Improvement
- 3 — Meets Expectations
- 4 — Exceeds Expectations
- 5 — Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory are reflective of a 1 or 2 on the above Likert scale.

For the first three (3) reappointment cycles, the Unit Head(s) shall review the credentials and work of the individual Faculty member and make a recommendation regarding reappointment. If the recommendation is positive, the Dean(s) (where not the Unit Head) shall review the recommendation and documentation. If the Dean's recommendation is positive, then the President shall review the recommendations and make a decision.

In the event that any of these decisions is not to reappoint, the appropriate Unit Committee, the College Committee (where appropriate), and the Provost's Advisory Committee shall be convened and a complete review by all committees shall be conducted and forwarded to the President.

It is expected that this process will be completed at the Unit level in time to coincide with the annual review process and the recommendation of salary increases. Each unit will publish, no later than the mid-point of the summer semester, the schedule for the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process for the following academic year.

For joint appointments, this process shall be modified so that the elected committee established shall include at least one individual from each Unit where the Faculty member holds an appointment, as well as all Unit Heads involved.

Critical Reviews

The purpose of the third year Critical Review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member's body of work in the areas of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service towards tenure. All previous annual evaluations must be part of the review. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion.

In the spring of the third year, a complete review of the Faculty member's credentials and intellectual contributions shall be conducted by the appropriate elected Faculty committee at the Unit level (or in the case of a joint appointment, the appropriate joint committee), the Unit Head(s), the Dean's Committee and the Dean (in those units having organizational elements such as schools or departments), and then by the Provost's Committee. Each recommendation will specify one (1) of four (4) outcomes:

- 'Reappointment'.
- 'Reappointment with counseling' which implies that academic performance, in most respects, is positive and appropriate, but that some 'mid-course corrections' are needed prior to the tenure decision.
- 'Reappointment with warning' which implies that, as the candidate moves toward the tenure decision, some substantial adjustments must be made in the academic performance if the outcome of that decision is to be positive.
- 'Non-reappointment' which means that the candidate should expect no contract to be offered beyond the following academic year.

All these recommendations shall be forwarded to the President who shall make the decision and then inform the appropriate individuals. This review should coincide with the annual salary review at the Unit level. A complete review may be conducted during the fifth year at the request of the candidate.

If the Critical Review at the end of the third year (as described above) results in a positive reappointment decision, the fourth year and fifth year reviews will be processed in the same way that the Administrative Reviews are conducted. If the decision is 'reappoint with warning' then the fourth year review process will be the same as the third year Critical Review. Similarly, if the fourth year decision is 'reappoint with warning' then the fifth year review process will be the same as the third year Critical Review.

The committee appointed to review the Faculty member's contributions will avail itself of the opportunity to review carefully the materials submitted by the individual and to comment in detail on the intellectual products of the candidate. Because this committee will be comprised of individuals who are knowledgeable in the field, the committee will have the responsibility of placing the candidate's contributions in context and to comment on the importance of the work. The Unit Head(s) should also obtain input from other Faculty members in the Unit regarding the candidate's contribution to teaching and service. This may include a Unit-wide committee to ensure consistency within the Unit across all candidates under review.

In the event that the Faculty member's service is interrupted by a leave of absence, then that particular year of absence or extension shall not be counted as contributing to the service periods stated in any of the above procedures. In any year of absence or extension, the Faculty member will be reviewed according to regular procedures, except that if a Critical Review would be called for as described above, that review shall be postponed until the next normal year of service.

Candidate's Responsibility

The candidate has the responsibility to prepare, review, and submit all required documentation and materials, except for evaluation letters, if applicable. 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, the Faculty member will receive a letter of non-reappointment.

Feedback to Faculty Members

It is important for the Faculty member to receive feedback regarding the assessments involved. The appropriate person for the individual Faculty member to receive this feedback is from the Unit Head(s). The Unit Head shall receive a copy of the recommendations prepared by each committee and by all other administrators with direct responsibility for reviewing the candidate, including the Dean (for those units where the Dean does not serve as the Unit Head), the Provost, and the President. The Unit Head shall review each recommendation, including their own, with the candidate, and counsel the candidate appropriately in a scheduled conference.

A written report of the faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure must be provided to the faculty member after the conference. The faculty member must sign a statement to the effect that they have been apprised of the content of the Critical Review evaluation.

The faculty member may respond in writing within ten (10) business days to the Critical Review evaluation. This written response is then attached to the evaluation. The Unit Head(s) must acknowledge in writing within 10 business days receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the written Critical Review evaluation made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response.

3.3.4 Tenure and Promotion Overview

This section sets forth guidelines for promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty and criteria to be used in granting of tenure. It is to be emphasized that this document lists criteria intended only as guidelines and not as a prescription for tenure and promotion. The possible factors to be used for evaluation are listed to aid the Faculty in their career development and to be used with, but not substituted for, enlightened judgment on the part of responsible administrators and Faculty in providing for the long-term development of Georgia Tech. (See Sections [3.3.5](#), [3.3.6](#), & [3.3.7](#).)

Promotion and tenure decisions are made separately, and guidelines for evaluation relative to each of these decisions are required. The philosophy underlying the two decisions differs, although the criteria used as a basis for each decision are similar. The performance of a Faculty member may justify promotion but not the awarding of tenure. The converse can occur, although it is not likely.

Promotion is based on the intrinsic merit of the individual's work. It recognizes the Faculty member for meeting the criteria of the next higher level in the professional hierarchy. The decision is based on an evaluation of the individual's scholarly activity including: a) teaching, b) **student success activities**, c) research/scholarship/creative activities, d) service, and e) professional development. The decision to promote or not to promote should not be tied in any way to questions of tenure.

In contrast to promotion, which is based on the merit of the individual's work, tenure represents the Institute's selection of a Faculty member for a long-term commitment. Individuals are selected whose performance is outstanding and whose capabilities and interests, as manifested in performance, most closely support the objectives of the Institute, the College, and the Instructional Unit. The decision is based on an assessment of the compatibility of the individual's performance and interest with the needs and objectives of the Institute, the college, and the individual Instructional Unit.

For a Faculty member to be considered for tenure, the individual's performance must be judged to be at or above the level appropriate to his or her professorial rank. That judgment should be based on the criteria set forth in the "Guidelines for Promotion at Georgia Tech" (see Section [3.3.6](#)). All dimensions of the performance must be considered, that is teaching, **student success activities**, research/scholarship/creative activities, service, and professional development. In appraising a candidate's qualifications for tenure, the weighting of the five (5) categories set forth above may vary for each case. It is recognized that the Institute has varied responsibilities and these responsibilities may best be met by a Faculty whose members have a mix of strengths. Given an appropriate level of performance, the primary criterion for tenure is the compatibility of the individual's performance and interests with the objectives of the Unit, the College, and the Institute. Statements and supporting documentation from the candidate, the Unit Head, and the Dean should address this question. Assuming an appropriate performance

level, the individual's professorial activity is evaluated relative to its compatibility with stated objectives.

Each Instructional Unit should have a set of clearly defined and prioritized objectives defined in accordance with the mission of that Unit. The more clearly and specifically the objectives are articulated, the more precisely can an individual's capability and interest be compared to those objectives. The objectives are not static; however, they must be influenced or modified by factors such as changing enrollment patterns and changes in the unit's and Georgia Tech's mission within the University System of Georgia. Modifications in objectives typically occur gradually, not instantaneously, thus permitting faculty awareness of the changes.

Normally, only Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors who are employed full-time (as defined by Regents' policies) by an institution are eligible for tenure. The term "full-time" is used in these tenure regulations to denote service on a 100% workload basis for at least two (2) out of three (3) consecutive academic terms. Faculty members with adjunct appointments shall not acquire tenure. The award of tenure is limited to the specified academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments.

Individual Faculty members may initiate a request for consideration for promotion or tenure, and this request must be processed through the prescribed channels. Candidates may, by written request, withdraw their candidacy at any stage without prejudice.

Promotion and tenure decisions may be appealed through the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee. Additional criteria or guidelines for promotion and conferral of tenure in professorial ranks may be established by the President in consultation with the Faculty Executive Board and shall be published and distributed to the Faculty.

Tenure resides at the Institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured individual is to the extent of continued employment on a 100% workload basis for two (2) out of every three (3) consecutive academic terms (normally for fall and spring terms) until retirement, dismissal for cause, release because of financial exigency, or program modification as determined by the Board of Regents.

These guidelines are in full accord with the policies and procedures of the Board of Regents; however, the Georgia Tech criteria are more demanding than those established by the Regents. These guidelines are intended to aid Tenure-Track Faculty in the conduct of their affairs in order to satisfy the requirements for promotion and/or tenure. They are not, however, a substitute for the advice and counsel of the Unit Head. All Faculty members should receive at a minimum an annual administrative review of their progress.

3.3.5 Tenure

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.7](#)

Criteria

Minimum expectations in all professorial ranks are:

- Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and instruction;
- Outstanding involvement in student success activities, as evidenced by activities within teaching and instruction, academic achievement, and service;
- Academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission;
- Outstanding service to the Institute, profession or community; and
- Professional growth and development, within the context of rank and responsibilities.

More details are provided in Section [3.3.7](#).

All tenure reviews must utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 — Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 — Needs Improvement
- 3 — Meets Expectations
- 4 — Exceeds Expectations
- 5 — Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the above Likert scale. Noteworthy achievement in all five (5) of the above is not required, but is expected in at least two (2) categories. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the unit concerned setting forth the reasons for granting tenure. The Faculty member's length of service with the institute shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be granted tenure.

In addition to the minimum criteria above, tenure at the rank of Associate Professor 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 being granted tenure.

Probationary Period and Credit

Tenure may be awarded, upon recommendation by the President, upon completion of a probationary period which is normally at least five (5) years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. A maximum of three (3) years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of Instructor or Lecturer at the

Institute. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing by the President at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher.

Maximum Time in Rank without the Award of Tenure

Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of Assistant Professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven (7) years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be proffered if a recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Institute. The maximum time that may be served in combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be ten (10) years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for the eleventh (11th) year may be proffered if a recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Institute.

Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time Instructor shall be seven (7) years.

Impact of Resignation on Tenure or Probationary Credit

Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution, written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given. In the event such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.

Extension of the Probationary Period for Tenure

The five (5) year probationary period must be continuous except that a maximum of two (2) years interruption because of a leave of absence or alternative service may be permitted, provided, however, that an award of credit for the period of an interruption shall be at the discretion of the President. In all cases in which a leave of absence is based on birth or adoption of a child, serious disability, or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member, the five (5) year probationary period may be suspended during the leave of absence. Extension of the probationary period changes only the year in which consideration for tenure is required, not the year in which the individual is eligible to be considered for tenure.

Purpose

The Georgia Institute of Technology has a critical interest in attracting and retaining a Faculty of the highest quality. This interest is enhanced by ensuring that Faculty members are promoted and tenured in ways that are fair and humane. To ensure equity in administering the system of academic tenure, the Institute must provide consistent conditions and standards while supporting members in balancing personal and family obligations with professional and scholarly achievement. For these reasons, extensions of the probationary period for tenure are reserved for compelling circumstances which impair the ability of an individual to establish the stature expected of Faculty members at Georgia Tech within the normal time frame.

Conditions

Approvals of extensions of the probationary period are never automatic but may be granted when circumstances cause substantial impairment of a candidate's ability to pursue his or her teaching and scholarly activities. Such circumstances may include severe personal illness, childbirth, adoption, or other significant obligations to a member of the family or household. The probationary period may not be interrupted for more than one (1) year per event with a maximum extension of two (2) years.

If an extension is granted, no additional requirements for tenure can be imposed upon the candidate by virtue of the extension. Thus, the candidate continues to be subject to the requirements to which he or she would have been subject without the extension.

The terms and conditions of this policy apply equally to **all genders**.

Procedures

Requests for an extension of the probationary period must be made in writing and submitted to the appropriate Unit Head (Dean/Chair) who will review the request. All requests must be made within twelve (12) months of the event related to the extension request. Any supporting documentation should be attached to the request. Requests are not granted automatically. Generally, however, Georgia Tech will attempt to provide extensions to all candidates who are making good progress and are requesting an extension due to childbirth or adoption. Other circumstances warranting extension are considered equally valid but must, necessarily, be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Every effort should be made to accommodate a request when it becomes clear that circumstances, consistent with this policy, will substantially impede the Faculty member's progress toward achieving indefinite tenure or promotion.

The Unit Head will forward the request to the appropriate Dean along with an evaluative statement addressing the Faculty member's scholarly progress. The Dean will make a recommendation and forward this request to the Provost for final action. Consistency with Board of Regents' policy dictates a required leave to be comprised of sick leave or other alternatives.

Unit Heads who recognize the need for a Faculty member to request an interruption of the probationary period are encouraged to discuss this policy with that individual and to do so in a timely manner. Faculty members should feel free to approach their Unit Heads for information concerning this policy or with individual requests for extension.

Administrative reviews will continue to occur on a regular basis and are unaffected by this policy. Critical reviews however, will be delayed with the probationary period extension.

3.3.6 Promotion

Criteria

Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section [8.3.6](#)

Minimum expectations in all professorial ranks are:

- Excellent teaching and effectiveness in instruction;
- Noteworthy involvement in student success activities, as evidenced by activities within teaching and instruction, academic achievement, and service;
- Noteworthy professional service to the Institute and/or the community;
- Noteworthy research, scholarship, creative activity or academic achievement; and
- Continuous professional growth and development, within the context of rank and responsibilities.

More details are provided in Section [3.3.7](#).

All promotion reviews must utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 — Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 — Needs Improvement
- 3 — Meets Expectations
- 4 — Exceeds Expectations
- 5 — Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory is reflective of a 1 or 2 on the above Likert scale. Noteworthy achievement in all five (5) of the above is not be required, but is expected in at least three (3) categories. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the unit concerned setting forth the reasons for promotion. The Faculty member's length of service with the Institute shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be promoted.

In accordance with Regents' policy for Research Universities, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor 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.

Guidelines for Promotion

From Instructor to Assistant Professor

- A doctorate in an appropriate discipline or experience which is of value comparable to the doctorate in preparing the candidate for the role of an educator;
- Clear evidence of effective teaching and involvement in student success activities; and
- Clear evidence of creativity.

From Assistant to Associate Professor

- Sufficient time in rank. Generally, five (5) or more years in rank are expected. Four (4) years in rank at the time of promotion, at least two (2) of them at Georgia Tech, or two (2) years of relevant professional experience plus two (2) years as an Assistant Professor at Georgia Tech, are a minimum requirement. Credit for previous academic or professional experience must be explicitly stated at the time of employment. Faculty may be considered for promotion with less than the required minimum four years in rank listed above. However, these cases would require strong justification and prior approval by the president before the promotion documentation is submitted.
- A doctorate in an appropriate discipline or experience which is of value comparable to the doctorate in preparing the candidate for the role of an educator;
- Clear evidence of effective teaching and involvement in student success activities;
- Clear evidence of creativity while at Georgia Tech; and
- Clear evidence of contributions to Georgia Tech in meaningful ways by service to the Institute, to the public, or to appropriate professional organizations.

A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor should satisfy the first four (4) of these qualifications. Marginal qualifications in any of these areas might be compensated for by strength in the fifth.

From Associate Professor to Professor

- Sufficient time in rank. Generally, six (6) or more years in rank are expected. Four (4) years of relevant professional experience at the time of promotion, at least two (2) of them at Georgia Tech, or two (2) years of relevant professional experience plus two (2) years as an Associate Professor at Georgia Tech are considered a minimum requirement before promotion. Credit for previous academic or professional experience should be explicitly stated at the time of employment. Faculty may be considered for promotion with less than the required minimum four years in rank listed above. However, these cases

would require strong justification and prior approval by the president before the promotion documentation is submitted.

- A doctorate in an appropriate discipline or experience which is of value comparable to the doctorate in preparing the candidate for the role of an educator;
- Significant contributions as an educator;
- Clear evidence of significant involvement in student success activities;
- Clear evidence of significant creativity;
- Evidence that the candidate is making substantial contributions to Georgia Tech by service to the Institute, to the public, or to the profession; and
- Broad recognition in terms of visiting professorships, invitations to give papers or seminars, memberships on national committees, offices in professional societies, or other appropriate honors.

A candidate for promotion to Professor should satisfy clearly the first five (5) of these qualifications and should have some demonstrable accomplishments in the last two.

3.3.7 Promotion and Tenure Evaluation

Evaluation of Faculty Members as Teachers and Educators

Criteria for effective teaching are difficult to define. As a minimum an effective teacher should continue to become more proficient in the subject matter and more efficient in achieving the objective of the courses being taught. An effective teacher should be able, especially, to motivate Students to do their best and to respond favorably to the teacher's enthusiasm for the subject.

The concept of educator implies a broad perspective toward higher education that encompasses more than effective teaching. It involves such things as leadership in developing new educational programs, including postgraduate educational programs, attracting graduate Students, developing new laboratory experiments, etc.

Listed below (with no attempt to suggest any rank order) are some types of evidence that may be used to evaluate the performance of a Faculty member as teacher and educator:

Course and Curriculum Development

- Development of new courses and laboratory experiences or new approaches to teaching.
- Extensive work in curriculum revision or teaching methods for the school or department.

Teaching Skills and Methods

- Relative performances of students in the candidate sections of multi-section courses.
- Participation in programs, conferences, or workshops designed to improve teaching skills.
- Awards or other forms of recognition for outstanding teaching.
- Systematic Student evaluations, such as exit interviews or other standardized questionnaires. Information such as percentage of Students providing data and a copy of evaluation instructions must be provided. (See Student Opinion of Courses and Instructors below).
- Demonstrated ability to teach basic courses effectively at the undergraduate and at the graduate level (when appropriate) where such courses are offered in the disciplines.
- Demonstrated ability to communicate effectively in the classroom environment.

Generation of Textbooks, Instruction Materials, and Publications on Teaching

- Publication of books or articles on teaching methods.
- Publication of new instructional techniques or descriptions of laboratory materials (if not listed under Creative Activities).
- Publication of textbooks (if not listed under Creative Activities).
- Effective utilization of audio-visual aids and multi-media where appropriate.
- Expository articles of broad interest exemplifying command of subject, breadth of perspective, etc.

Evaluation of Creative Contributions

While difficult to define precisely, creativity is characterized by the making of original and innovative contributions. The nature of the creative work must be appropriate to the individual's discipline. Moreover, it must be shown that significant creative activity has been performed while at Georgia Tech. To provide objective evaluation of creative activities, external peer review normally is required. The review should be based only on the individual's work and should not include opinions regarding promotion or tenure. A brief description of the reviewer, including positions and title, should be included. In general, the quality of such activities is of more importance than the sheer quantity. In cases where the creative work is a joint effort with others, there must be clear evidence that the individual under consideration has taken a leading role in conducting the work.

The creative work may be in a variety of forms. The nature of the material offered and the relative weight assigned to the various types of activity will vary among disciplines. Some examples of creative activities that may be appropriate at this institution are as follows:

Publications

- Research papers in scholarly journals, literary publications, and books.

Unpublished Writings and Creative Work of Limited Circulation

- Technical reports, engineering and architectural designs, and grant applications
- Inventions leading to patents
- Presentations at conferences and meetings.

Creative Educational Contributions

- Innovative teaching methods, research in instructional techniques, and textbooks.

Artistic Creations

- Paintings, sculpture, and music.

External Recognition of Creative Work

- Prizes and awards, invited presentations, and consultancies.
- For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor there should be clear evidence that the person has demonstrated an ability to make original and innovative contributions to a chosen field.
- For promotion to Professor there should be clear evidence that the person has demonstrated consistent performance in the making of original and innovative contributions that are nationally recognized for their excellence.

At all levels, the candidate's creative accomplishments throughout his/her entire career should be considered and special attention given to those that occurred at Georgia Tech.

Student Success Activities

Evaluation of Faculty on Student Success Activities

Activities that faculty members perform that contribute to student success encompass a wide spectrum of formal and informal interactions with students. Some examples of student success activities include effective advising, career counseling and mentoring; supervision of undergraduate and graduate research; supervision of students who are working in instructional activities, such as lectures, laboratories, recitations, self-paced instruction or tutoring; forms of experiential learning; specialized teaching for honors students or other types of special programs; presentation of lectures on special topics; participation in panel or group discussions, directing field trips, serving as faculty moderator of a student activity; engaging in extra-academic activities with students; engagement in other high impact practices; development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities to deepen student learning.

Supervisors will evaluate faculty members on their student success activities that are relevant to their job responsibilities and roles. Faculty members are afforded the discretion to determine the student success activities that they undertake; however, as required by the Board of Regents, faculty members must report their activities, and supervisors must evaluate faculty members using the scale outlined in the USG Academic and Faculty Affairs Handbook.

Documenting Student Success Activities

For the purposes of annual evaluation, faculty members will document their student success activities as described below.

- Identifying student success activities on a Curriculum Vitae or Annual Evaluation form.
- Responses to one or more questions from CIOS that relate to the learning environment may also be included. If CIOS scores are used, normative data for the School, College and Institute should be provided.

For the purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review, faculty members must discuss their student success activities in their personal narrative statement. For faculty members who are the primary advisors of students or postdoctoral scholars in research, that narrative must describe their activities that promote research and professional skill development, a climate of mutual respect, inclusion, and open and clear communication, and guidance on degree completion and career exploration. In a Curriculum Vitae, faculty members who are the primary advisors of students or postdoctoral scholars in research will list advising outcomes, including a list of students and post-doctoral students mentored that identifies each student's accomplishments, such as awards, publications, and academic progression.

Evaluation of Service Activities

While Faculty members usually contribute to the Institute primarily through teaching and creative activities, they also may contribute significantly to the development of Georgia Tech through rendering appropriate types of service to the Institute, to the public, and to the professional organizations to which they belong.

Professional Education

There is a rapidly escalating need for postgraduate professional education opportunities for persons to deepen, broaden, and raise the level of their knowledge and understanding, both in their professional field and in general. For this reason, Faculty participation in professional education activities constitutes a service to the public, to professional fields which seek to serve that public, and to the Institute.

Service to the Academic Community

Presenting lectures, participating in seminars, developing research proposals with other faculty members, serving on committees, study groups and task forces, and lending one's professional expertise to other faculty members for their benefit. The quality of the member's participation in such activities should be documented.

Service to the Institute

Significant service to the offices of the Institute, such as Institute Relations and Development, the Alumni Association, the Athletic Board, Education Extension teaching, special student services, recruitment and similar activities; and serving on various Institute committees. Documentation of these activities should include statements regarding the frequency of meetings, records of attendance, offices held, contributions to special reports, etc.

Availability for Service Activities

Maintaining regular office hours and expressing willingness to serve whenever opportunities are available. Documentation should include a statement from the Unit Head.

Service to the Profession

Membership in professional organizations; attendance at professional meetings and conferences, organizing professional meetings, serving as a discussant of papers read by others at professional meetings or being a panel member at such meetings, holding office in professional organizations; contributing consultative, advisory, editorial service in a professional capacity, and serving as site visitor for accreditation review. Documentation should include appropriate records, awards, or other forms of recognition.

Service to the Community

Community Service involves a wide range of activities directed toward local, state or national groups. Examples of such service include:

- Lectures;
- Panel discussions;
- Radio and television appearances;
- Membership on advisory boards or civic committees;
- Involvement in community, charitable organizations, or the government;
- Involvement in youth and citizen recreation programs; and
- Advising students or judging the entries at science fairs.

Appropriate documentation of service activities should be included. For persons being considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the rendering of service in any of these categories is appropriate. For persons being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor, participation in service activities is required, and some form of leadership activity is expected.

Student Opinion of Courses and Instructors

To provide instructors with information about Student opinions of their teaching and courses, the Institute has developed the Course/Instructor Opinion Survey (CIOS). Provision is also made for written comments from the students.

The surveys are conducted on-line and instructors may access the results for their courses on-line.

Unit Heads receive the responses to the Institute core items, and any optional questions from the respective units; however, they receive neither the responses to any additional optional items the instructors may have elected to include, nor the written comments. Students have access to the responses to the core Institute questions if the response rate is over a threshold requirement.

The results of the CIOS serve as one (1) component of an overall assessment system for documenting teaching proficiency. The survey, processed by the Center for Teaching and Learning under the auspices of the Provost, is administered in each School or College on a systematic basis during fall and spring semester each year. In addition, the survey system is available during summer semester. CIOS scores themselves cannot be used to justify a 1 or 2 rating for Teaching on the Likert scale; another, independent measure must be provided.

3.3.8 Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Candidate's Responsibility

The candidate has the responsibility to prepare, review, and submit all required documentation and materials, except for 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 and/or tenure may be delayed until the following year. However, if such a delay would have the effect of violating the maximum time of employment for an untenured Faculty member, the Faculty member will receive a letter of non-reappointment.

Format for Promotion and/or Tenure Packages: Guidelines for Candidates

It is important that all candidates follow as closely as possible the same format in preparing the documentation for promotion and/or tenure packages, although some flexibility should be allowed. All candidates must include a copy of their curriculum vitae. The candidates should also write a brief summary of their major accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to teaching, research, **student success activities**, 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 candidates also are required to submit evidence of three (3) to five (5) examples of their relevant, creative capabilities. These may include published papers, books, software, patents, art productions, or other relevant examples.

Format for Promotion and/or Tenure Packages: Guidelines for Units

It is appropriate that each set of documents prepared by a Unit be preceded by letters of transmittal from the Unit Head, and from the Committee referenced in Internal Peer Review Section below, and the Peer Review Committee of that School. These will include comments regarding whether a candidate meets the required qualifications for each separate point of the promotion and/or tenure guidelines (See Sections [3.3.5](#) & [3.3.6](#)). These comments should be brief and highlight the more significant contributions in each area. The presentation should be written so that the merits of the case are fully apparent to persons who may not be familiar with the discipline of the individual under consideration. Comparison of the relative merits of multiple candidates from within the department is encouraged.

The letter of transmittal should be followed by a curriculum vitae, prepared by the candidate, detailing the relevant career activities of the individual. Finally, the package may include further relevant documentation such as letters of evaluation, student evaluations, and (if unavoidable) copies of unpublished creative work.

External Peer Review

Letters of recommendation from appropriate individuals outside the Institute must be obtained by the Unit for any decisions related to tenure or promotion. The individuals from whom letters are sought should be clear leaders in the field. Brief biographical sketches of these individuals should be included in the materials submitted for consideration, as well as the letters received. Generally, the letter writers should not have a personal or professional connection to the candidates (e.g., dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, research collaborator). If letters from such individuals are included, they must be in addition to those normally required, identified as such, and filed separately from other external letters. A justification for including letters from these individuals must be included in the package.

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

A candidate for Promotion and Tenure may request that a particular individual not be contacted as an external reviewer. Such requests are typically honored. If the School Chair or Dean 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 Unit Head(s) and supplied to the office of the Dean. These letters shall be solicited with the understanding that, insofar as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion/tenure decision.

All candidates will be asked to sign a waiver indicating whether or not the 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 Peer Review

Each College (or Unit within a College) should determine and publish appropriate measures of scholarly impact of Faculty candidates for Promotion and Tenure. Each Promotion and Tenure package should include an explicit discussion of the impact of the candidate's scholarship relative to the College's or Unit's measure of impact.

The first-level Peer Review Committee should be tailored for each candidate so that it is composed of Faculty in the same or related fields or technical interest areas. The Unit Head typically appoints this committee in consultation with the unit RPT Committee. Candidates shall have the opportunity to suggest to the Unit Head(s) the names of individuals who would be appropriate members of the committee. For joint appointments, input should be obtained from the Faculty of both units. In the event that the individual units do not have appropriate

expertise relating to the candidate's specific creative contributions, the committee may include individuals who are not members of the Georgia Tech faculty.

Expanded Peer Review

A unit-wide committee may be appropriate in large units with a number of sub-disciplines to provide some consistency across units and to comment on the teaching and service contributions of the candidate.

Decisions Involving Joint Appointments

A committee drawn from appropriate individuals of each Unit shall be established to provide recommendations. In the event that individual Units do not have appropriate expertise related to the candidate's specific creative contributions, a special committee shall be constituted and may include individuals who are not members of the Georgia Tech Faculty. All Unit Heads involved jointly shall provide recommendations. These recommendations will then be passed along to the next level(s) as appropriate.

Joint Academic/GTRI/Center Appointments

Promotion and/or tenure decisions of academic Units will be based on their own criteria; however, letters of evaluation from appropriate GTRI Unit Heads and/or Center Directors must be included in the documentation of these candidates. Appropriate individuals from GTRI or the Center normally will be included in the unit-level committees appointed to make the initial recommendation.

The Provost and Executive Vice President's Advisory Committee

The College Deans, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, and senior members of the Faculty representing the Colleges, comprise the advisory committee. Vice-Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development may participate in the discussions of the committee but does not vote. Similarly, the college Deans participate in the discussion but do not vote on the candidates from their colleges nor do representatives from a specific unit (such as Physics) vote on Faculty members from that unit. Normally, the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development chairs the meetings. The Committee forwards all packages, along with its recommendations to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Recommendation of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs considers all information that has been compiled, transmits the complete package along with his/her recommendations to the President, and then notifies the college Deans of the recommendations involving Faculty within their respective colleges.

Final Dispositions and Reports

Upon approval of the award of tenure and/or promotion to an individual by the President, that individual shall be notified in writing by the President; notification will be forwarded to the Board of Regents.

An annual report shall be made to the President by each Unit of the Institute on the status of its Faculty. The annual report shall include the numbers of tenured and non-tenured Faculty, by rank. Individuals who have been retained in full-time faculty status at the Institute for a period in excess of seven (7) years without the award of tenure shall be identified by name and justification for such retention given. These reports shall be available for public inspection.

The Institute shall provide data annually to the Board of Regents, showing the Institute's tenure rates by gender and race.

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 Unit Head(s). The Unit Head shall receive a copy of the recommendations prepared by each committee and by all other administrators with direct responsibility for reviewing the candidate, including the Dean (for those Units where the Dean does not serve as the Unit Head), the Provost, and the President. The Unit Head 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 [USG Human Resources Administrative Manual Employee Relations Grievance Policy](#) states that a grievance is not available to dispute promotion and tenure decisions. Therefore, only the processes through which promotion and tenure decisions are made can be appealed to the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee (FSGC) (See "Grievance: Process and Procedures," Section 3.1.9). The FSGC's findings regarding appeals on promotion and tenure decisions are limited to recommendations to the President. Such recommendations may include the candidate resubmitting their promotion and tenure materials the following year without penalty.

3.3.9 Post-Tenure Review Policies

3.3.9.1 Post Tenure Review

Purpose

The post-tenure review (PTR) process supports the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensures accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the PTR process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that shall enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, the Institute, and the Institute's mission. PTR is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual performance evaluation.

PTR facilitates faculty development and ensures intellectual vitality and competent levels of performance by all faculty throughout their professional careers. In both regards, the goal is to maximize the talents of tenured faculty within the broad array needed for effective performance of the Institute and its units. The Institute recognizes that the granting of tenure for faculty is an important protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. This PTR policy defines a system of periodic peer evaluation of all tenured faculty, which is intended to enhance and protect the guarantees of tenure and academic freedom. PTR shall be conducted by a committee of faculty peers.

The review should be both retrospective and prospective because it recognizes past contributions and provides the means for continuing intellectual and professional growth. As a faculty development tool, PTR provides an opportunity to assist tenured faculty members in formulating a multi-year plan of professional growth and activity in teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success activities, and service based on their interests and the needs and mission of the unit and the Institute. It is recognized that, within the traditional mix of professional activities, different emphases may be appropriate at different stages in a faculty member's career, therefore it encourages a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career. The review encourages a careful look at the mix of professional activities that are appropriate at the time of review.

To assure professional competence, PTR provides an opportunity to assess the tenured faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success activities, and service, and over a multi-year period. Assessment of professional activities over a relatively long timespan encourages faculty members to undertake projects and initiatives that do not readily lend themselves to annual evaluation.

The outcome of a PTR may be either a recommendation for a five (5) year review if the faculty member's performance is partially successful or better, or a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) if the faculty member's performance does not meet expectations or needs improvement.

Timeline

All tenured faculty members who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo PTR five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g., School Chair, Dean, Associate Provost), or for other acceptable reasons, discussed below.

Consistent with University System of Georgia policies, a tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for PTR before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual five-year cycle. Early PTR should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since the last evaluation for tenure or a previous PTR, whichever was the most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next PTR shall be five years from the voluntary PTR date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the five-year PTR review date remains in place.

Areas of Evaluation

The evaluation must address the faculty's accomplishments related to teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and service, including student success activities. Evaluative rubrics, and any changes to these rubrics must be created jointly by faculty and administrators within the framework of faculty governance. Evaluative rubrics, and any changes to these rubrics, must be approved by a vote of the unit's tenured faculty using any applicable unit-level faculty governance procedures. Faculty undergoing PTR must receive a copy of any rubrics at least 30 days before the due date of their PTR package. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the Institute through their teaching, student success activities, scholarship and creative activities, and service. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous five-year period.

Any deviations from the review criteria must be stated explicitly and in writing. Examples of such deviations include faculty members who have no interactions with students and administrators who have no teaching responsibilities. The School Chair is responsible for formulating individualized alternative criteria, after consultation with the faculty member; an understanding regarding such criteria must be reached and confirmed in writing prior to documentation submission. If there is no agreement on criteria, the faculty member may request a hearing by the unit's PTR committee. The committee's decision on criteria is final.

Submission of PTR Package by the Faculty Member

- A cover sheet;

- A copy of the approved individualized evaluation criteria, if applicable;
- A current curriculum vitae;
- A statement from the faculty member, of up to five (5) pages;
 - If the faculty member is undergoing a second or subsequent PTR, the statement must include information on how goals from the previous review have been met.
 - The faculty member should state their goals for the next five (5) years.
- The faculty member's teaching evaluations;
 - For the faculty member's first PTR, all evaluations should be included.
 - For subsequent reviews, only course evaluations from courses taught since the last evaluation should be included.
- Annual performance evaluations for the previous five (5) years; and,
- If desired, a rebuttal of the School Chair's assessment letter (see School Chairs Assessment Letter section, below) may be included.

School Chair's Assessment Letter

After receipt of the PTR package, the School Chair shall prepare a summary and assessment based upon the agreed criteria.

- The letter shall be supported by the faculty member's annual evaluations and rebuttals, if any. If it is not, the faculty member should be given the opportunity to comment on the summary.
- The letter should also include a detailed assessment of the faculty member's goals for the next five (5) years.
- The faculty member's annual performance evaluations (to include rebuttals) for the years under consideration shall be appended to the unit head's letter.
- The School Chair shall provide these documents to the faculty member for review and possible rebuttal (see Submission of PTR Package section, above).
- When complete, the School Chair shall deliver these documents (School Chair's summary and assessment letter, faculty member's annual evaluations and rebuttals, and Faculty member's rebuttal to School Chair's letter) to the unit PTR committee.

Unit-Level PTR Committee

Composition

The unit's faculty shall determine the composition of the committee, with the following limitations:

- The committee must have at least three (3) members.
- The committee shall be composed of tenured academic faculty from the unit of the faculty member's primary appointment.
- The committee shall be elected by secret ballot vote of the unit's tenured faculty. The unit may establish procedures for the committee election using its own applicable

faculty governance rules and procedures. The unit's FAC (Faculty Advisory Committee) shall conduct and be the final arbiter of the election.

- If a candidate has a joint appointment with budget sharing, then
 - The majority of the committee members for such faculty members shall be from the primary unit; and
 - At least one (1) member of the committee must be from the non-primary unit.
- The School Chair shall not be a member of the committee. Whether to include administrative faculty members other than the unit head is up to unit faculty. This decision shall be reviewed every five (5) years.
- A single committee may review all PTR cases or, if approved by a majority vote of the unit faculty, a subcommittee of at least three (3) of the elected members may review a PTR case.
- The faculty of the unit will adopt a replacement plan by faculty vote, which ensures a sub-committee of at least three (3) members.

The faculty member to be reviewed may:

- Provide input on the composition of the committee or subcommittee for consideration by the unit faculty.
- Select a member of the committee to serve as an "advocate" or choose to add another tenured faculty member who meets committee membership criteria to serve as "advocate", with voice and vote.
- Remove one (1) person from the committee without cause.
- Request the removal of any other committee member in the case of a documented conflict or issue. The members of the PTR committee, without the member subject to the objection, will determine whether to honor the request to remove the member.

Review Process

The committee shall:

- Examine the documentation provided by the faculty member and the School Chair.
- Assess faculty member's past performance and goals for the next five (5) years. The assessment should be written, contain the information specified below, and support the committee's recommendation.
- Determine whether the faculty member's overall performance is:
 1. Does not meet expectations
 2. Needs improvement
 3. Meets expectations
 4. Exceeds expectations
 5. Exemplary

A Successful Evaluation (rated “Meets Expectations” or Above) Resulting in a Five (5) Year Review Recommendation

The committee's report shall contain:

- Narrative text listing rating and commending partially successful or better performance.
- Identification of and recommendation for necessary improvements (if any).
- Recommendations for necessary improvements (if any).
- Recommendation for five (5) year review.
- Record of committee's vote by numbers of votes in each of these categories (Yes, No, Abstain). Names of the committee members are not to be attached to each vote.
- The signatures of all members of the PTR committee.
- Comments on faculty development and resources appropriate for execution. For associate professors, this should include activities to enhance prospects for successful promotion.

A Not Successful Evaluation (Rated “Does Not Meet Expectations” or “Needs Improvement”)

The committee's report shall contain:

- Narrative text listing not successful evaluation and containing both critique of not successful performance and commendation of positive aspect of performance.
- Identification of and recommendation for necessary improvements (if any).
- Record of committee's vote by numbers of votes in each of these categories (Yes, No, Abstain). Names of the committee members are not to be attached to each vote.
- The signatures of all members of the PTR committee.
- Comments on faculty development and resources appropriate for execution. For associate professors, this section should include activities to enhance prospects for successful promotion.

Communication of Outcome of Reviews:

The committee shall submit one package to the School Chair containing:

- PTR Committee report,
- Supporting documentation, and
- School Chair’s assessment of faculty member’s goals and performance.

The School Chair will forward the package to the Dean of the faculty member’s college. The Dean of the faculty member’s College will review the results of the PTR and communicate its results to the faculty member. This shall include the package and a letter summarizing the findings of the PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR, rated “Does Not Meet Expectations” or

“Needs Improvement,” the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that shall be attached to the final document; however, no action is required by the School Chair. In the case of an unsuccessful PTR, the School Chair shall meet with each faculty member to discuss its results and the subsequent steps. Faculty members may request a meeting with their School Chairs to discuss the results of the PTR.

The Dean shall provide a copy of all documents to the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty. The Vice Provost’s Office, through Faculty Affairs, maintains all files of reviews.

Outcomes and Consequences of Post-Tenure Review

The results of a positive PTR should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at exemplary levels should receive recognition for their achievements.

Performance Improvement Plan

The Performance Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable PTR. In the event of a PTR that results in “Does Not Meet Expectations” or “Needs Improvement,” the faculty member’s School Chair shall work with the faculty member to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based upon the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the PTR, so as to scaffold faculty growth and development and to strengthen future promotion possibilities. The PIP must contain the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and support,
5. Expectations for improvement, and
6. Monitoring strategy.

The PIP’s goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable within the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. A PIP must also reflect the timing of a faculty member’s contract; remediation cannot be required of a faculty member outside of the contract period. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs where permanent faculty files are housed. The School Chair and the faculty member must meet formally twice during each of the fall and spring semesters to review progress, document additional needs/resources, and planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the School Chair shall summarize the meeting and indicate whether

the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP; this summary shall be provided to the faculty member and placed in the faculty member's file within the School or unit.

Review of the Performance Improvement Plan

At the conclusion of the academic year, the PTR committee shall convene to review the faculty member's progress and submit the committee's feedback to the School Chair and Dean.

The PTR committee shall review the faculty member's progress as recorded by the School Chair and any information provided by the faculty member. The PTR committee may exercise its judgement as to whether an in-person meeting is necessary. The recommendation of the PTR committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The PTR committee shall issue its recommendation based solely on a review of the record and the results of any meetings to the School Chair, Dean, and the faculty member by the end of the spring semester.

After considering feedback from the PTR committee's review of the faculty member's progress and recommendation, the School Chair and Dean shall determine if the faculty member has remediated the deficiencies identified by the committee or made substantive progress towards remediation, which shall be considered successful completion of the PIP.

The School Chair and Dean's assessment of the PIP shall take the place of that year's annual performance evaluation. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next PTR shall take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the School Chair and Dean may recommend appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. If the School Chair and Dean recommend remedial action, the faculty member may request due process as explained below. The President shall make the final determination on behalf of the Institute regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the Institute's final decision pursuant to the Board of Regents Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review 6.26.

3.3.9.2 Corrective Post-Tenure Review

A tenured faculty member evaluated as deficient, which is defined as a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" or "Needs Improvement," in any one of the elements of teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and service, including student success activities, for two consecutive annual evaluations shall participate in a corrective post-tenure review. Note that

the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review shall be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review.

A faculty member's corrective post-tenure review shall be conducted using the procedures for post-tenure review listed in Faculty Handbook 3.3.9.1 and any other applicable Institute or unit guidance. Faculty members subject to corrective post-tenure review are afforded the same rights and protections as a faculty member subject to post-tenure review, including but not limited to rights related to committee composition and the PTR committee's Due Process Review.

A faculty member subject to corrective post-tenure review due to consecutive annual performance evaluations must be notified so in writing. A faculty member will have thirty (30) business days from written notification to submit a PTR package, as identified in Faculty Handbook 3.3.9.1, for the corrective post-tenure review.

If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member shall reset the post-tenure review clock. If the outcome of a corrective post-tenure review is "Does Not Meet Expectations" or "Needs Improvement," the same process for an unsuccessful PTR shall be followed, including a Performance Improvement Plan, Review of the Performance Improvement Plan, and Due Process.

3.3.9.3 Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or Corrective Post-Tenure Review

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the Performance Improvement Plan, the School Chair and Dean determine that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the School Chair and Dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies.

1. The faculty member may appeal the Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or the School Chair and Dean's assessment that the faculty member has failed to make sufficient progress as outlined in the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) to the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee, following the procedures outlined in 3.3.9.4 Post-Tenure Review Appeals.
2. Within five (5) business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty notifying them of the decision.
3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within five (5) business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision

shall be made within ten (10) business days of receipt of the faculty member's appeal and should notify the faculty member of their decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.

4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.
5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to [Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review \(6.26\)](#).

3.3.9.4 Post-Tenure Review Appeals

3.3.9.4.1 Post Tenure Review Appeals Committee Composition and Election

The Faculty Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee (PTRAC) shall consist of seven tenured (7) members elected by the Institute's tenured faculty. There shall be one member elected by faculty vote from each academic College and one member elected at-large. A faculty member may serve two consecutive terms. The PTRAC shall elect its own chair. The Secretary of the Faculty should ensure that the terms of the committee members overlap, so that the entire committee does not turn over at once. The PTRAC will concern itself only with appeals from both PTR and CPTR.

3.3.9.4.2 Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee Operating Policy

- A. The Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee (PTRAC) shall hear only appeals from a post-tenure reviews (PTR) and corrective post-tenure reviews (CPTR) in which the faculty member has received an evaluation of "unsatisfactory" (i.e., a rating of 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or 2 – Needs Improvement) by their School's or unit's post-tenure review committee. Before an appeal may be filed with the PTRAC, the faculty member must have exhausted all available and appropriate administrative remedies within the school or college. If the faculty member then wishes to file an appeal with the PTRAC, they must submit a written request for appeal to the PTRAC stating the grounds on which the appeal is based. This written request must be filed with the PTRAC within ten (10) business days after a final decision has been rendered by the school or college under the available and appropriate administrative appeals procedure.
- B. In extraordinary cases, the PTRAC, in its sole discretion, may grant a variance from the exhaustion requirement if the appellant petitions the PTRAC for such a variance in writing and shows good cause why the exhaustion requirement (as noted above in paragraph A) should not apply. The written request for variance must be filed with the PTRAC within ten (10) business days of receiving the unsatisfactory post-tenure evaluation.
- C. In considering appeals, the PTRAC will act as a committee of the whole. The Chair shall be a voting member of the committee. A final decision requires a simple

majority of the whole committee (4/7). To avoid conflicts of interest, members of the PTRAC shall not serve on any other post-tenure review committee during their term as a PTRAC member.

- D. Once an appeal is filed, the PTRAC may consider the fairness of the evaluation process within the post-tenure review School or unit, the reasonableness of the determination, as well as the appropriateness of the course of action suggested by the post-tenure review School or unit that might strengthen the faculty member's performance. In addition to the written appeal, the committee, in its sole discretion, may hear and consider oral testimony.
- E. If the PTRAC decides that the decision of the post-tenure review unit is fair and valid, and that the suggested course of action for improvement is appropriate, the decision of the unit's post-tenure review committee will then be final and binding on the appellant.
- F. If, instead, the PTRAC decides that the evaluation process was flawed or that the determination of unsatisfactory is invalid, the PTRAC may (1) order that the matter be reheard by the School's or unit's post-tenure committee as if the matter had not previously been heard before and as if no decision had been previously rendered, or (2) it may order that the decision of the School's or unit's post-tenure review be reversed outright. If the PTRAC decides that only part of the review is appropriate, for whatever reason, the PTRAC may remand the matter to the School's or unit's post-tenure review committee for further action as directed by the PTRAC.
- G. If the PTRAC decides that the evaluation itself is fair and valid, but the suggested course of action for improvement is not appropriate, the PTRAC may 1) hold meetings with the School's or unit's post-tenure review committee, the appellant, and the School Chair in order to reach a satisfactory solution, 2) remand to the School's or unit's post-tenure review committee with recommendations, or 3) refer to outside mediation.
- H. The decision of the PTRAC is final and binding. The prior decision of any other committee is not binding on the PTRAC, although the PTRAC may take such a decision into consideration. If issues before the PTRAC are being considered simultaneously by the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee, the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee proceeding shall be stayed until the PTRAC renders its decision.
- I. The PTRAC shall not hear appeals concerning the formal plan of faculty development (PRP, PIP, etc.). This formal plan is established by the School Chair and the faculty member in consultation with the School's or unit's post-tenure review committee after all requests for reconsideration and appeals have been exhausted.
- J. The PTRAC will render its decision on the appeal within twenty (20) business days of the filing of the appeal.
- K. A record of any action taken as a result of an appeal, including all documents related to the appeal, will be maintained by the Office of Faculty Affairs in the Provost's office.

3.3.9.5 Colleges without Schools

For Colleges without Schools, the Dean shall appoint a tenured, full professor from within the College, who is experienced in the annual evaluation of faculty members, to carry out, independently of the Dean, the duties of the School Chair as listed in this section.

3.3.9.6 Conflict Resolution

Pursuant to 3.1.9, members of the faculty who believe their rights, under the aforementioned provisions, have been invaded or ignored shall have a right to request consideration of their case by the Faculty Status and Grievance Committee.

NOTE: Section 3.3.11 (Process for 5-Year Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of Deans of Academic Units) will be deleted

3.3.10 Evaluation of Academic Administrators

Purpose

The performance of each academic administrator will be reviewed annually by their supervisor based on criteria related to their duties. In addition, a comprehensive formal review must be completed at the end of every fifth year of appointment for tenured faculty who have an administrative appointment of 50% or greater.

The criteria for review will be based on the duties of the administrator as determined on appointment or later updates to those duties. For tenured faculty administrators, the supervisor and faculty member should determine relevant criteria related to traditional faculty activities (i.e., teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the administrator's position. These appropriate criteria are included in the annual and comprehensive reviews.

The purpose of a comprehensive review is to evaluate the progress of the administrator and to provide the opportunity for constructive input from Faculty and other constituencies. It is typical to appoint a tenured or tenured-track administrator for terms of three (3) to five (5) years, and the comprehensive review may be used to determine if the administrator should be appointed for additional terms.

It is recognized that all administrators, including Deans and School Chairs, serve at the will of their immediate supervisors and higher administrators. Nothing in this review process is meant to limit the ability and responsibility of higher administrators to make changes in leadership positions whenever it is deemed necessary or desirable.

Also see USG policy 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel and USG ASAH sections 4.7 Post-Tenure Review and 4.8 Evaluation of Faculty.

Five-Year Review Procedures

The general procedures for a 5-year comprehensive review of academic administrators is discussed here, while the specific criteria and procedures for review of school chairs and deans are given in Sections 3.3.10.1-2.

The 5-year comprehensive review should be completed by a committee, with membership as determined by the procedures in the faculty administrator's School or unit. The committee should receive from the administrator: a summary of activities and accomplishments, a list of job duties, a self-evaluation, and the results of prior annual reviews. The overall review should include a 360° evaluation that incorporates feedback from a variety of constituents such as the students, peers, and other groups as appropriate to the role. The administrator being reviewed has a chance to make comments on the committee's report.

The report, and any additional comments from the administrator, is presented to the supervisor. The supervisor will make their own written assessment of performance and share it with the administrator under review. Based on that assessment and results of the committee's review, the supervisor will make a decision on reappointment and on any improvements that should be made. The supervisor will inform the administrator and the review committee in writing of the decision.

The 5-year comprehensive review is allowed to take the place of the standard post tenure review for tenured administrators.

3.3.10.1 Process for 5-Year Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of School Chairs

Additional processes and procedures specific to the 5-Year comprehensive review of school chairs are outlined in this section.

Purpose

The purpose of such a comprehensive review is to evaluate the progress of the School under the Chair's leadership, to provide the opportunity for constructive input from Faculty and other constituencies, and to review the professional contributions and performance of the Chair as a "leader" and an "administrator."

Ultimately, the purpose of such comprehensive reviews is to determine whether the Chair should be reappointed for another term. A second five (5) year appointment has been typical whereas a third five (5) year appointment is unusual. Nevertheless, the reappointment decision will be based on the best interests of the Institute, College, School, and individual.

Criteria and Procedures

A review committee is appointed by the Dean of the College as follows:

- The Committee will consist of no fewer than five (5) members.
- A majority of the Committee members shall be chosen from tenured, non-administrative Faculty members in the School.

- The Committee Chair shall be chosen by the Dean in consultation with the School's Faculty Advisory Committee.
- The Committee will normally be chaired by a senior Faculty member.
- The Committee Chair is normally from a different academic School in the College.
- The School Chair has the opportunity to comment on the composition of the Committee.

Establishment of Criteria to be Used in Reviews

The review criteria are to be defined by the Dean and the candidate prior to initial appointment or the Dean and the Chair prior to reappointment. As part of this review criteria, the Dean and Chair will determine the traditional faculty activities (i.e., teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the Chair's position. As part of the Dean's annual review of the Chair, the criteria may be reaffirmed or modified in consultation with the Chair of the School. As part of the Dean's charge to the review committee, the Dean will review the evaluation criteria established at the beginning of the Chair's current term, as well as any changes made since that time. Specific responsibilities of school chairs that fall within these general criteria and must be included in the review are posted on the Faculty Affairs website.

General Criteria

- Demonstrating evidence of commitment to the highest standards of quality in teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and academic development with evidence of the School's actual progress on all three (3).
- Providing effective management of internal affairs of the School.
- Recruiting/retaining the highest quality Faculty, Staff, and Students.
- Managing the School's fiscal affairs.
- Developing/maintaining open communications with all constituencies.
- Facilitating goal setting by individuals, programs, and by the School as a whole.
- Identifying issues and resolving conflicts affecting the School.
- Developing internal and external resources.
- Implementing fair and equitable performance evaluations and salary adjustments.
- Establishing a working environment conducive to achieving individual and School goals, as well as balancing and reconciling diverse interests with the School.
- Building relationships with constituencies within and outside of Georgia Tech.

Review Process

The Dean may schedule the review for any time between four (4) and five (5) years after either the initial appointment of the Chair or the preceding formal review. The review may be timed to coincide with the mandatory Board of Regents' five (5) year Program Review. The review process described below provides 360° feedback assessment. Utmost confidentiality must be maintained during the review process. The Dean will provide the Committee with confidentiality guidelines at their first meeting.

Early in the process, the Chair should be asked to meet with the review committee to provide a self-assessment. The Committee should seek input from the School's Faculty, Staff, and Students, and other constituencies as well as peers including other school chairs. The Committee should identify areas where the Chair should place added emphasis/attention if he/she continues to lead the School over the next five (5) years.

Conclusion of the Review

The Committee provides the Dean with a confidential, written report of no more than six (6) pages. The report shall include:

- Assessment of the School's progress under the Chair's leadership.
- Evaluation of the Chair's performance as a leader and administrator, including a summary of the results of the feedback from each of the constituency groups.
- For chairs who are tenured: evaluation of the teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success, and service that align with the responsibilities of their position as determined by the Dean and Chair.
- Recommendations for improvement (if any).

The Chair being reviewed will have the opportunity to comment on the report. The Dean will evaluate the report and write their own assessment of the School Chair's performance. The Dean will make a decision regarding the reappointment of the Chair and communicate results of the review both orally and in writing to the Chair. The Dean will inform the Review Committee of the reappointment decision.

3.3.10.2 Process for 5-Year Comprehensive Review and Evaluation of Deans

Additional processes and procedures specific to the 5-Year comprehensive review of deans are outlined in this section.

Purpose

The purpose of such comprehensive reviews is to evaluate the progress of the Schools under the Dean's leadership, to provide the opportunity for constructive input from Faculty and other constituencies, and to review the professional contributions and performance of the Dean as a leader and an administrator.

Ultimately, the purpose of such comprehensive reviews is to determine whether the Dean should be reappointed for another term. A second five (5) year appointment has been typical whereas a third five (5) year appointment is unusual. Nevertheless, the reappointment decision will be based on the best interests of the Institute, College, School and individual.

Criteria and Procedures

A Review Committee shall be appointed by the Provost as follows:

- The Committee will consist of no fewer than five (5) members.
- The majority of the Committee members shall be chosen from tenured, non-administrative Faculty members in academic units supervised by the Dean.
- The Committee will normally be chaired by a senior Faculty member.
- The Committee Chair is normally from a different College/Unit.
- The Committee Chair is chosen by the Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Executive Board.
- The Dean has an opportunity to comment on the composition of the Committee.

Criteria Established to be Used in Reviews

The review criteria are to be defined by the Provost and the candidate prior to initial appointment, or the Provost and the Dean prior to reappointment. As part of this review criteria, the Provost and Dean will determine the traditional faculty activities (i.e., teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the Dean's position. As part of the Provost's annual review of the Dean, criteria will be reaffirmed or modified in consultation with the Dean. As part of the Provost's charge to review committee, the Provost will review the original criteria as well as any changes made.

General Criteria

- Demonstrating evidence of commitment to the highest standards of quality in teaching, scholarship and creative activities, and academic development with evidence of College's actual progress on all three (3).
- Providing effective management of internal affairs of the College.
- Recruiting/retaining the highest quality administrators, Faculty, Staff, and Students.
- Managing the College's fiscal affairs.
- Developing/maintaining open communications with all constituencies.
- Facilitating goal setting by individuals, programs, Schools, and by the Unit as a whole.
- Identifying issues and resolving conflicts affecting the Unit.
- Developing internal and external resources.
- Implementing fair and equitable performance evaluations and salary adjustments.
- Establishing a working environment conducive to achieving individual and Unit goals, as well as balancing and reconciling diverse interests within the College.
- Building relationships with constituencies within and outside of Georgia Tech.

Review Process

The Provost may schedule the review for any time between four (4) and five (5) years after either the initial appointment or the preceding formal review. For Colleges without Schools, the review of the Dean may be timed to coincide with the Board of Regents' five (5) year Program Review. The review process described below provides 360° feedback assessment. Utmost

confidentiality must be maintained during the review process. The Provost will provide the Committee with confidentiality guidelines at their first meeting.

Early in the process, the Dean should be asked to meet with the review Committee to provide a self-assessment. The Committee should seek input from Chairs, Faculty, Staff, Students, and other constituencies as well as peers including other deans. The Committee should identify areas where the Dean should place added emphasis/attention if he/she continues to lead the Unit over the next five (5) years.

Conclusion of the Review

The Committee shall provide the Provost with a confidential, written report of no more than six (6) pages. The report shall include:

- Assessment of the College's progress under the Dean's leadership.
- Evaluation of the Dean's performance as a "leader" and "administrator", including a summary of the results of the feedback from each of the constituency groups.
- For deans who are tenured: evaluation of the teaching, scholarship and creative activities, student success, and service that align with the responsibilities of their position as determined by the Provost and Dean.
- Recommendation for improvement (if any).

The Dean being reviewed will have opportunity to comment on the report. The Provost will evaluate the report and write their own assessment of the Dean's performance. The Provost will make a decision regarding reappointment of the Dean and communicate the results of the review both orally and in writing to the Dean. The Provost will inform the Review Committee of the reappointment decision.