The following documentation is required, and in the order listed, for academic faculty under consideration for tenure, promotion, or reappointment requiring a full review. While the documents listed below only list the review steps through the school level, a full review consists of the following additional review levels after the school chair review:

- College Committee
- Dean
- Provost and Executive Vice President’s Advisory Committee (aka Institute Committee)
- Provost
- President

All votes are advisory to the President who makes the final decision.

**Note these documents should be submitted as individual freestanding documents and not as one document:** A full review is necessary in those reappointment cases for which a faculty member:

- is in his or her third year of tenure-track service;
- is in his or her terminal year and requests such a review;
- received a warning in a full review in the previous year; or
- requests such a review or his or her School Chair requests such a review.

All other reappointment reviews are administrative reviews. All items highlighted in yellow are to be provided by the candidate.

1. **“REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE” COVER SHEET**

   These are completed by the RPT administrator in each school and verified by the Dean’s office.

2. **CANDIDATE’S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

   This is a summary of key information in the candidate’s file. The biosketch should begin with the candidate’s name, rank, and school; degrees; and history of time at Georgia Tech. It should then briefly explain the candidate’s research area, including why it is important. A sentence or two on awards and impact may be included. The biosketch should be written in the third person, be no longer than 150 words, and be provided on a separate page. No picture of the candidate should be included in the biosketch or anywhere else in the file.

3. **SCHOOL CHAIR RECOMMENDATION LETTER**

   The School Chair’s letter, addressed to the dean, should evaluate the candidate on all three criteria for promotion and/or tenure: teaching, creativity, and service. The School Chair’s letter should focus
on: (1) the quality and impact of the candidate’s scholarship (creativity), broadly defined (such as the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and/or instruction, as appropriate to the candidate) and their relationship to the educational mission of the Institute; (2) the quality and impact of the candidate’s teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, classroom observation, and/or evaluation of instructional materials provided by the candidate; and (3) the significance of the candidate’s contributions and leadership to the profession and the significance of the candidate’s contributions to either the School, College, and/or the Institute. The school chair’s letter recommends for or against promotion and/or tenure, with separate votes where both decisions are being made.

4. **School Committee Recommendation Letters**

The School Committee’s letter, addressed to the school chair, should comment on the three areas listed in 3 indicating clearly in their letter whether or not the candidate meets the standard(s) for promotion and/or tenure in that unit with regard to that criterion. ‘Split’ votes should be explained and any conflicts of interests between a committee member and the candidate must be documented and described in the letter. This letter may be signed by the committee chair on behalf of the rest of the committee.

5. **Area Committee Letter**

The Area Committee’s letter should provide an in-depth assessment of the quality of the candidate’s most significant scholarly accomplishments (creativity) only. For candidates working in interdisciplinary areas, consideration should be given to the inclusion of members from outside the School who would be able to assess the candidate’s work. The Area Committee’s assessment should be made independent of the external letters of reference, and they should not vote or express judgment on the question of promotion and/or tenure. This letter must be signed by all members of the area committee.

6. **Candidate’s Summary of Instruction Opinion Survey** (See separate instructions.)

7. **List of References in a Table**

The Provost requires a minimum of five letters of reference. Reviewers should be “clear leaders in the field” of the candidate, such as full professors at equivalent or better institutions or senior leaders in industry research. Associate professors should be avoided, but if they are used, the unit should certify that they are tenured. Letters of reference are required only for cases involving tenure or promotion; they are not required for any reappointment reviews.

Refer to the [college’s guidelines on the solicitation of external references](#), and then provide information about the references using the format of a table. This table should contain the reference’s name, affiliation, who suggested the reference, dates of notification requesting a reference letter, date reference letter was received, the reference alias number to be used by subsequent committees in referring to the reference letter, and any pertinent notes related to the reference. References submitted and not selected should also be included in this table. Refer to the external reference list table template for details.

External references should be “senior experts in the field represented by the scholarship of the candidate. The faculty candidate can recommend external reviewers, but the majority of the letters
should come from reviewers selected by the Chair, the faculty committee, or the Dean. If an external reviewer has a personal or professional connection to the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisor, postdoctoral mentor, research collaborator), this should be stated in the documents. A substantial majority of the letters should not have personal or professional connections to the candidate.

A candidate for P&T 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 overwhelming reasons necessitate use of that reviewer, the letter must be in addition to those normally required, identified as such and included separately from the other external letters.” (R. Bras Memo, April 2012) Please refer to memo from Provost Rafael Bras on the College of Engineering website.

8. **One Sample of the Letter Used to Solicit External References**

The letter must include the statement: "The Georgia Institute of Technology will maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation to the greatest possible extent. While the Georgia Open Records Act does apply, Dr. {Name} has waived his right under the Act to view your evaluation.” In cases of non-waiver, the letter must include, “The Georgia Institute of Technology will maintain the confidentiality of your evaluation to the greatest possible extent. However, the Georgia Open Records Act does apply, and Dr. {Name} has not waived his right under the Act to view your evaluation.” This sample letter must be from the school chair.

9. **External Reviewer Biosketches**

One consolidated document that contains a biographical sketch for each reference. One paragraph (approximately 50-100 words) maximum for each reference. NIH biosketches and CVs will not be accepted.

10. **Reference Letters**

Provide copies of all correspondence received from the references. If a letter of reference was solicited but was not received, please so indicate in the list of references in item 7.

11. **Candidate’s Personal Narrative**

Five page maximum. The statement should provide perspective on the candidate’s accomplishments at Georgia Tech with regard to teaching, research, and service. The narrative should be written in the third person, with a three-page minimum and five-page maximum limit with one inch margins, standard single-spaced, and 10 point minimum font. This is the candidate’s “voice” in the file, the place that provides an opportunity to explain context and significance. Candidates should point out innovative elements of their work and the impact it is having. They can use the statement to clarify their contributions in collaborative work. The statement should not merely summarize the examples of creative capabilities but rather place them in the context of the school, college, Institute, and discipline.
12. **Candidate’s Vita in Institute Format** (See separate instructions.)

This CV should have a date and contain a table of contents with numbered pages.

13. **Waiver of Right of Access to Confidential Statements (Not Required for Critical Review)**

The following statements must be included in the candidate’s material and signed by the candidate. The review process for the candidate cannot begin until the waiver has been signed and turned into the RPT administrator. Failure to complete the waiver in a timely manner will result in the candidate not undergoing review. The candidate must choose one statement.

___ I waive my right to access to any information contained in any letter of reference included in my reappointment/promotion/tenure materials and agree that such letters shall remain confidential.

___ I prefer not to waive my right.

I understand that in either case, references will be informed of my choice.

________________________________  ____________
      Signature                      Date

14. **Candidate’s Statement of Completeness**

The following statement must be included in the candidate’s material and signed by the candidate. This statement must be on its own piece of paper separate from the waiver.

I have reviewed my vita for reappointment/promotion/tenure. I attest to its completeness and accuracy to the best of my knowledge.

________________________________  ____________
      Signature                      Date
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